

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1984

IDENTITY CONGRUENCY AND IDENTITY MANAGEMENT AMONG GAY MEN.

GARY J. MCDONALD

University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

MCDONALD, GARY J., "IDENTITY CONGRUENCY AND IDENTITY MANAGEMENT AMONG GAY MEN." (1984). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2372.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/2372>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

CANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

3/5-1030-X

65539

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR Gary J. McDonald

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE Identity congruency and identity
management among gay men.

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE Ph.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE Spring 1984

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE Dr. Henry Minton

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

*L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.*

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

*L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.*

DATED/DATE January 18/84 SIGNED/SIGNÉ G.J. McDonald

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE _____

IDENTITY CONGRUENCY AND IDENTITY
MANAGEMENT AMONG GAY MEN

by

Gary J. McDonald

M.A., University of Regina, 1977

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Psychology
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy at the
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario, Canada
1984

©

Gary J. McDonald 1984

804293

APPROVED BY:

Henry L. Minton
Chairman

W. W. Clark

Stewart Page

Steve Horen

ABSTRACT

Two hundred and fifteen gay men volunteered to participate in a study of the relationship among identity congruency, identity management, and homophobic prejudice. A major focus of this investigation concerned the extent to which these men had achieved a sense of identity congruency. In general, identity congruency referred to the integration of sexual behaviors, feelings, fantasies and self-image into one personal or valid identity. Three broad sets of predictions were proposed. First, in relation to the sample, four distinct groups were expected to emerge. These groups were expected to differ in terms of their levels of identity congruency, identity management, sexual behaviors/fantasies and homophobic prejudice. Second, respondents who indicated simultaneously that they were "totally homosexual" in terms of sexual preference, gay-identified and completely out of the closet would be closer than others to achieving an optimal level of congruency. Third, those respondents who had achieved a sense of identity congruency would differ from others by not engaging in heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies, indicating less concerns about identity management (i.e., less fears about increased openness, less passing and less uneasiness in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending), and evidencing lower levels of homophobic prejudice. Results partially confirmed these expectations. However, a number of interesting unexpected findings emerged. The four proposed groups of respondents did not materialize--the sample was skewed with individuals who tended to be gay-identified and relatively open about their sexual orientation.

Considering the predicted interrelationship among the three types of identity, chi-square and correlational analyses revealed less interdependence than expected. Considerable variability existed among respondents in terms of how they had rated themselves in reference to sexual preference, self-preference labels, and being in the closet. Respondents were grouped according to each type of identity and a discriminant function analysis was performed. Results indicated that sexual preference groups were discriminated in terms of sexual activities and fantasies. "Label" groups were differentiated on variables related to sexual activities, fantasies, identity management, and homophobic prejudice. "Closet" groups were discriminated in terms of demographic and age-related milestone events, identity management and homophobic prejudice. In reference to identity congruency, those who were "totally homosexual" as opposed to "predominantly homosexual" were closer to achieving an optimal level of identity congruency. They reported minimal involvement in heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies. Similarly, both gay-identified respondents and those who were out of the closet also appeared closer to achieving an optimal level of identity congruency. They differed significantly from others by indicating less concerns about identity management and reporting lower levels of homophobic prejudice. The culmination of these findings suggested that those respondents who are better adjusted in terms of integrating and managing a personal identity tend to be totally homosexual in terms of sexual preference, gay-identified and out of the closet. The significance of those findings were discussed in relation to the current body of literature on identity congruency and identity management among gay men. Recommendations for future research were outlined.

DEDICATION

Mrs. Phyllis (Cynthia) Mitchell:

for believing in me.

May you rest

in peace!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals contributed their concern, expertise and wisdom in order to see this dissertation to its finality. It is impossible to name them all or identify their specific contributions. Those who are acknowledged here offered unconditional support and encouragement for which I am truly grateful.

I am deeply indebted to my mentor and supervisor, Dr. Henry Minton. In the four years of graduate study under his guidance and supervision, I not only gained a broader understanding of Psychology but I also developed a deep friendship—one that will always be remembered with fondness and admiration.

I would like to thank Dr. Stewart Page for assuming a supervisory role in Henry's absence. I appreciated Stewart's insights and patience in seeing the dissertation to completion.

I feel especially fortunate to have had an opportunity to work with Dr. Meyer Starr. On many occasions, at a moment's notice, Meyer was willing to share his knowledge of statistics. In that process, I not only learned a great deal but also received the caring and support that every graduate student requires in order to "stick with it."

I would also like to thank Dr. Stephen F. Morin, the external examiner, for his kind comments and helpful suggestions. I have always looked up to Steve for his clarity of vision and his solid political understanding of gay people's struggles.

I would like to thank the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada for financially supporting the last three and a half years of my research.

It is rare to find a friend and typist so dedicated as Liz Duffin. Not only did she memorize the APA style manual but also completed major portions of the manuscript on short notice. Her enthusiasm often inspired me to surge forward when I had virtually little or no energy left to do so.

I appreciated the encouragement offered by friends in both Windsor and elsewhere. A special thanks is extended to Stan and Doris Pands (Regina), Isabelle Warmke (Regina), Eugene Boychuck (Winnipeg), Don and Sylvia Walsh (Tempe, Arizona), Ann Sprague (Toronto), Phyllis Elliott (Toronto), and Barry Evans (London). I also appreciated the concern and support of my dear friend, Mary Ricketts. My fondest recollections of graduate school will always include Mary. I would also like to thank Jim Holowecky for his sense of humor—at times, it was my only source of entertainment.

To those individuals who helped to distribute the research questionnaire, I am indebted.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge Dan Rebain for his patience, love and understanding. You have given me a rare gift that will always be cherished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Chapter	
I	
INTRODUCTION	1
Homosexual Identity Formation	3
Homosexual Identities Versus	5
Homosexual Behaviors	
Commitment to a Homosexual Identity	8
Gay Versus Homosexual Identities	10
The Effects of Homophobia on	10
Identity Development	
Identity Management	12
The Measurement of Homosexual Identity	14
Purpose of the Present Investigation	16
Group 1	16
Group 2	17
Group 3	17
Group 4	18
Expected Findings	19
II	
METHOD	21
Sampling Procedure	21
Measures	23
Identity	24
Coming Out Process	24
Disclosure to Significant Others	25
Fears about Increased Openness	25
Social Situations	26
Passing Strategies	26
Sexual Activities	27
Attitudes toward Homophobic Prejudice	27
Summary	29
III	
RESULTS	30
Section One	30
Description of the Sample	30
Section Two	31
Sexual Preference, Self-preferred	31
Labels and Being in the Closet	

TABLE OF CONTENTS continued

Chapter		Page
	Section Three	38
	Dependent Variables	38
	Disclosure to Significant Others:	38
	Score I	
	Fears Associated with Greater	39
	Openness: Score II	
	Social Situations: Score III	39
	Passing Strategies: Score IV	41
	Attitudes Toward Homophobic Prejudice:	41
	Scores V-VII	
	Milestone Events in the Coming Out	42
	Process	
	Sexual Activities	45
	The Correlational Relationships Among	46
	Dependent Variables	
	The Relationship Between Independent	48
	and Dependent Variables	
	Section Four	48
	Discriminating Among Groups	48
	Sexual Preference	51
	Self-preferred Labels	54
	In and Out of the Closet	58
	Differences Between Groups on All	70
	Dependent Variables	
	Section Five	73
	Summary of Major Findings	73
IV	DISCUSSION	76
	Representativeness of the Sample	77
	The Relationship Among Three Identities	79
	Sexual Preference, Label and Closet Groups	81
	Sexual Preference	82
	Self-Preferred Labels	83
	Being in the Closet	85
	Relationships Among Dependent Variables	87
	Summary	88
	Recommendations for Future Research	89
Appendix		
A	LETTER OF EXPLANATION	92
B	GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	94
C	QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION	96

TABLE OF CONTENTS continued

		Page
Appendix		
D	RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE	98
E	NHAI SUBSCALES AND SCORING KEYS	114
F	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	118
G	RESPONDENTS' SCORES ON SEXUAL PREFERENCE, SELF-PREFERRED LABELS AND BEING IN THE CLOSET	125
H	CORRELATIONS AMONG ALL DEPENDENT VARIABLES	129
I	ABBREVIATED CODES OF RESEARCH VARIABLES	145
REFERENCES		149
VITA AUCTORIS		154

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Chi-square Analysis: Preference x Label	33
2	Chi-square Analysis: Preference x Closet	34
3	Chi-square Analysis: Label x Closet	35
4	Chi-square Analysis: Preference x Label x Closet	36
5	Significant Others Listed as Knowing About Respondent's Sexual Orientation	40
6	Means and Standard Deviations for Major Dependent Variables	43
7	Means and Standard Deviations for Milestone Events	44
8	Correlations Among Identity Measures and All Other Variables	49
9	Discriminant Functions for Preference	52
10	Classification Tables for Preference	55
11	Discriminant Functions for Label	56
12	Classification Tables for Label	59
13	Discriminant Functions for Closet: Two Groups	61
14	Classification Tables for Closet: Two Groups	63
15	Discriminant Functions for Closet: Four Groups	64
16	Classification Tables for Closet: Four Groups	68
17	t-tests and Anovas for Independent Variables	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A plethora of social psychological literature exists documenting the process of identity formation (Cooley, 1902; Erikson, 1968; Goffman, 1963; Mead, 1934; Rainwater, 1970; Stone, 1962; Strauss, 1959). A critical review of this literature indicates that there is no consistent definition of "identity" or consensual agreement among theorists as to the process by which identity is firmly established (see Saram & Hirabayashi, 1980). Among theorists, however, there is general agreement in Rainwater's (1970) assertion that everyone requires an integrated or congruent identity in order to achieve a sense of well-being and an optimal level of psychological adjustment. There is general agreement, too, that the emergence of a valid identity is influenced by both the individual's coping strategies and cultural milieu. In other words, the process of identity construction and maintenance is contingent upon both individual (internal) and social (external) factors. What differentiates theorists is the varying degrees of emphasis attributed to either of these factors.

Viewing the interaction of individual and social factors as a salient dynamic of the identity formation process, symbolic interactionists conceptualize identity emergence as a never-ending process highly dependent upon the expectations of others. Of particular interest are those interactionist theories of both Rainwater (1970) and Stone (1962). According to Stone (1962):

Identity establishes what and where the person is in social terms ... one's identity is established when others place him as a social object by assigning the same words of identity that he appropriates for himself or announces (p. 93).

Echoing similar sentiments, Rainwater (1970) believes that a valid personal identity is achieved when the individual "reconciles his conception of himself and his community's recognition of him" (p. 374). He defines a valid identity as "one in which the individual finds congruence between who he feels he is, who he announces himself to be and where he feels his society places him" (p. 375). Identity conflicts emerge when there are discrepancies between what a person feels they are, who they announce themselves to be, and how that pronouncement is viewed by others. Inconsistencies among these three components result in a fragmented or incongruent identity.

Assuredly, in our everyday interactions, we are expected to adopt a variety of identities (Goffman, 1963; Iee, 1966). In most instances, these multiple identities co-exist in harmonious equilibrium. However, there are instances when an individual assumes sets of identities that may be at variance with one another. Identity conflict will ensue-- especially in the event that one set of chosen identities is regarded as socially devalued. According to Goffman (1963), when an individual assumes an identity or possesses a trait that is socially devalued and hence stigmatized, issues of identity management become overriding concerns for that person. By stigmatization, Goffman (1963) means:

When an individual who might have been received easily in ordinary social intercourse possesses a trait that can obtrude itself upon attention and turn those of us whom he meets away from him, breaking the claim that his other attributes have on us (p. 5).

Goffman makes a distinction, though, between those whose stigma is visible and therefore not manageable (e.g., "the discredited") and those

who are able to hide or reveal their stigma at will (e.g., "the discreditable"). Women and blacks would comprise the former category while alcoholics and ex-convicts would be representative of the latter group. According to Goffman (1963), the main task for the discreditable involves managing information about their undesirable trait or identity. Decisions concerning disclosure of the devalued status preoccupy the lives of "the discreditable" as they must choose in each social situation how much "to display or not to display; to tell or not to tell; to let on or not to let on; to lie or not to lie; and in each case, to whom, how, when and where" (p. 42).

Within this context of identity formation and identity management, the present investigation explored a group of individuals that fit Goffman's description of the "discreditable"--namely, homosexual men. Two broad questions were focal concerns of this research. First, what are the various identities that homosexual men choose and in what ways are these identities accurate predictors of the styles of identity management adopted by gay men? Second, what factors are related to the acquisition and eventual maintenance of the various identities chosen?

Homosexual Identity Formation

As a developmental process, achieving a homosexual identity involves a restructuring of one's self-concept, reorganizing one's personal sense of history, and altering relations with others and with society--all of which reflects a complex series of cognitive and affective transformations as well as changes in behavior (de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978; Riddle & Morin, 1977). A number of critical milestones have been identified as salient aspects of homosexual identity formation and these include: awareness of same-sex feelings, initial homosexual encounters,

participation in the gay culture, questioning societal norms surrounding heterosexual identity, labelling oneself as homosexual, disclosing that identity to others, and finally, accepting such an identity with pride and dignity (de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978; Hencken & O'Dowd, 1977; Lee, 1977; Plummer, 1975; Riddle & Morin, 1977; Schaefer, 1976; Troiden, 1979). Various models have been formulated in order to interpret and organize these milestone experiences (Cass, 1979, Dank, 1971; de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978; Hencken & O'Dowd, 1977; Lee, 1977; Plummer, 1975; Troiden, 1979).

Recently, Minton and McDonald (in press) employed Habermas' (1971, 1979) theory of ego development in an attempt to provide some synthesis and coherence to these various models. According to these authors, two developmental tasks can be delineated in forming a homosexual identity:

First, there is the process of forming a homosexual self-image--one that reaches completion with the individual's acceptance of a positive gay identity. Once a gay identity has been attained, the second task is that of identity management. Identity management refers to the extent to which the person chooses to be identified as gay by self or others in interpersonal or public situations (Minton & McDonald, in press).

Consistent with previous definitions of identity, Minton and McDonald point out that successful completion of both tasks is a prerequisite to achieving an integrated, personal identity.¹ If the person fails to complete the tasks, personal identity will remain fragmented. Rather than achieving an identity synthesis, lack of integration will culminate in an incongruent identity.

Notably, Minton and McDonald indicate that for some individuals

¹Rainwater (1970) would use the term valid identity rather than personal identity.

identity synthesis may not be possible given the powerful and overriding effects of social discrimination. They raise the issue of whether or not identity synthesis can ever be achieved for all but a few as long as prejudice and discrimination toward gay persons prevail. Indeed, the effects of prejudice and discrimination have been generally acknowledged as a salient factor in explaining both the process of identity formation and identity management among gay men (Dank, 1971; de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978; Hencken & O'Dowd, 1977; Lee, 1977; McDonald, 1982; Plummer, 1975; Troiden, 1979). Plummer (1975) maintains that:

The single most important factor about homosexuality as it exists in this culture is the perceived hostility of the societal reactions that surround it. From this one critical factor flow many of the features that are distinctive about homosexuality. It renders the business of becoming a homosexual a process that is characterized by problems of access, problems of guilt and problems of identity. It leads to the emergence of a subculture of homosexuality. It leads to a series of interaction problems involved with concealing the discreditable stigma ... homosexuality as a social experience simply cannot be understood without an analysis of the societal reactions toward it (p. 102).

With Plummer's perspective in mind, the theoretical literature regarding homosexual identity formation will be examined to identify areas where empirical studies are required to verify theoretical claims concerning the acquisition of a homosexual self-image.

Homosexual Identities Versus Homosexual Behaviors

A number of models of homosexual identity development have noted the discrepancy which may exist between homosexual behaviors and self-designation (Cass, 1979; Coleman, 1981/1982; Dank, 1971; Hencken & O'Dowd, 1977; Lee, 1977; Plummer, 1975). That is, individuals who engage in homosexual activities may not necessarily designate themselves as homosexual. This phenomena has been documented in studies of married

men (Humphreys, 1970; Miller, 1978). Various concepts have been formulated to explain its occurrence. Troiden (1979) felt that through a process of "dissociation" the individual partitions conscious sexual feelings and/or activity from one's heterosexual self-image. Similarly, Malyon (1981) identified this process as "compartmentalization" and maintained that as a result of the person's internalization of negative attitudes toward homosexuality, a personal homosexual identity is rejected.

According to Cass (1979), individuals whose behavior is predominantly homosexual but whose self-definition is not, are experiencing "identity confusion" and are preoccupied with the question, "If my behavior may be called homosexual, does this mean that I am a homosexual?" (p. 223). Cass stated that such questioning could culminate in a tentative commitment to a more crystalized homosexual self-definition; however, identity incongruency could also be resolved in two other ways: (1) by avoiding and inhibiting further homosexual contacts, or (2) continuing one's homosexual activities while negating that such experiences necessarily imply that one is homosexual. In addition to absorbing countless amounts of time and energy, this latter strategy involves the employment of various defense mechanisms-- including rationalization and denial.

Cass (1979) indicates that individuals may absolve themselves of responsibility for their homosexual activities by variously rationalizing the event as "an experiment, a means of earning money, a favor for a friend, an accident, being taken advantage of, or going along with everyone else" (p. 255). Miller (1978) reported that among his married subjects, homosexual activities were justified in the absence of

fulfilling sexual experiences with female partners. Tripp (1975) has speculated that denial can also involve a careful monitoring of the role one assumes in the sexual act and the kind of sexual activity allowed or engaged in. As Tripp (1975) states:

Many men feel free to respond to other males when and if they can maintain a "masculine" role in their own eyes by avoiding emotional expressions that would imply an investment in the partner, and by otherwise seeing their actions as free of anything "feminine." They preserve their male image by being the dominant partner in anal intercourse, or by lying back to be fellated. That both acts are highly phallic, that neither is receptive (in the sense of being penetrated), and that both could occur with a heterosexual partner all support the rationalization that what they are doing is "not really homosexual" (p. 134).

Tripp (1975) also points out, however, that not all men who deny their homosexuality are "role conscious". Indeed, some men

May feel especially free to be submissive, since this is entirely in line with their particular rationalization: that the whole motivation for sex comes from the partner. Often they are ready to be actively oral, too, provided the partner is clearly responsible for having started things ... the underlying assumption seems to be that to overtly move toward a partner is the essence of commitment and desire, while to react to a sexual opportunity is "only natural" especially if one is caught up in another persons' desire (p. 136).

Other theorists have speculated that a lack of emotional involvement (i.e., no kissing, hugging, etc.) allows participants to view their experiences as merely sexual and not self-committed (de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978). Given the extent to which fantasies play a prominent role in sexual activities and expression (see Lehne, 1978), perhaps men who engage in homosexual behaviors, especially those who are heterosexually married, maintain a "heterosexual" self-image while fantasizing about women. Miller (1978) notes that some of his heterosexually-identified married men fantasized about men while maintaining sexual relations with their wives. In addition to the degree

of fantasy during sexual relations, where sexual encounters with other men take place may provide additional information concerning the respondent's self-image. Some studies have noted that married men choose specific arenas for sexual conquest--namely, washrooms (Humphreys, 1970), highway rest stops (Troiden, 1974), parking lots (Ponte, 1974), and gay bathhouses (Weinberg & Williams, 1974).

In retrospect, the cumulative results from these studies suggest that a lack of commitment to a homosexual self-image is a distinguishing feature in conceptualizing varying degrees of homoerotic expression. More importantly, these findings also suggest that this "lack of commitment" may be actively achieved through a careful employment of various behaviors, attitudes, and fantasies. Obviously, extensive empirical data are required to integrate such disparate phenomena and substantiate theoretical propositions.

Commitment to a Homosexual Identity

Just as engaging in homoerotic activities does not necessarily culminate in a homosexual self-definition, acceptance of such a definition does not necessarily imply that a person feels positive about who they are. In other words, acceptance of a homosexual self-image should not imply commitment to such an identity. According to Cass' (1979) model, arriving at a homosexual identity evolves in a tripartite fashion as the person progresses from "tolerance" through "acceptance" to eventual "commitment". What differentiates persons at these various levels of identity is both their attitudes toward homosexuality and their involvement in the gay community.

A number of studies have indicated that initial exploration of the

gay community has often provided the catalyst to eventual self-designation as homosexual (Cass, 1979; Coleman, 1981/1982; Lee, 1977; Plummer, 1975; Troiden, 1979), and that arriving at a positive gay self-image is closely related to the individual's continued participation and involvement in the gay culture (Humphreys, 1979; Humphreys & Miller, 1980; McDonald, 1983). However, Cass (1979) indicates that immersion in the gay culture is not, in and of itself, sufficient enough to achieve a positive gay identity—one that the individual acknowledges with pride while simultaneously rejecting heterosexual values. In a similar vein, Troiden (1979) differentiates those who have achieved "commitment" from those at the "acceptance" stage, claiming that "commitment presupposes a reluctance to abandon the [homosexual] identity even if given the opportunity to do so" (p. 371). Cass (1979) maintains that those so committed are "proud to be gay" and display feelings of anger in relation to societal homophobia and its resultant prejudice and discrimination of gay persons. According to Cass (1979), "the slogan 'How dare you presume I'm heterosexual' is indicative of feelings of this stage" (p. 233).

What the previous models of identity construction suggest is that there are varying levels of identity. Individuals may assume either positive self-definitions or remain non-positively homosexual-identified. Furthermore, these models of identity development suggest that in differentiating those with a positive gay identity from those without such a self-definition, one would expect to find differences in attitudes toward homosexuality. Recent empirical data lend some support to these theoretical contentions (McDonald, 1982; Nungesser, 1979; Sommers, 1982).

Gay Versus Homosexual Identities

In a recent investigation of identity development among gay men, McDonald (1982) discovered that gay-identified men differed in relation to how they felt about such self-definitions. A number of respondents indicated that they were "not glad to be gay." Positively gay-identified men differed from others on a number of measures reflective of psychological health. In comparison to gay-identified men, individuals with a negative homosexual self-image had "more negative attitudes about homosexuality; participated less in the gay subculture; disclosed less about their affectional/sexual preferences to others; and felt guilty, anxious, and ashamed about being homosexual" (McDonald, 1982, p. 56). These findings imply that it may be psychologically healthier to achieve a positive gay identity, and reflect, as well, a recent distinction in the literature between "gay" and "homosexual" self-definitions. In distinguishing these self-definitions, Weinberg (1972) and Morin and Schultz (1978) note that someone who is gay-identified rejects the negative societal stereotype associated with being homosexual. Morin and Schultz (1978) indicate that "from this perspective, a gay identity is healthy, and a homosexual identity is not, in that the homosexual identity internalizes negative stereotypes" (p. 61).

The Effects of Homophobia on Identity Development

According to Morin and Garfinkle (1978) homophobia refers to an irrational fear or intolerance of homosexuality. Its significance for gay men is that once such attitudes are internalized, homophobia contributes to the person's self-hate and the development of a negative self-image. The extent to which the internalization of negative stereotypes about homosexuals have impacted on identity formation was

recently confirmed by Nungesser (1979) and Sommers (1982).

Nungesser (1979) developed a homophobic prejudice scale and administered it to a non-clinical sample of 50 homosexual men. By homophobic prejudice, Nungesser meant an irrational fear or hostility directed against oneself and other homosexuals. He discovered that subjects with low degrees of homophobic prejudice generally disclosed their homosexual identities to significant others and also described themselves as "completely out of the closet". Nungesser (1979) explained these findings by indicating that "if an individual feels positively about his homosexuality; he shares this part of his life more freely with others than if he feels negatively" (p. 56). The researcher concluded that achieving a positive gay identity was contingent upon the degree of homophobic prejudice present in the individual.

Utilizing Cass' (1979) model of identity, Sommers (1982) replicated Nungesser's findings. Sampling 97 homosexual men, Sommers examined the relationship among homophobic prejudice, present social network support and levels of interpersonal congruency of a gay identity. His findings indicated that "persons who presently report a high degree of interpersonal congruency of a gay identity also report a low degree of homophobic prejudice, and perceive their social networks as supportive" (Sommers, 1982, p. 88).

In summary, findings from these studies point to the importance of homophobia as a contributing factor that influences gay men's eventual self-definitions. These self-definitions also have implications for the styles of identity management that are enacted. Empirical studies have yet to fully explore the relationship between varying identities among gay men and the concomitant identity management styles engendered by each.

Identity Management

In order for an identity synthesis or congruency to take place, one's personal and public sexual identities have to be integrated into one image of the self, and this integrated self-image has to be supported from the person's interpersonal environment (Cass, 1979; Minton & McDonald, in press). The task of integrating one's personal and public identities involves disclosing such an identity to significant others, such as family members, friends, and work colleagues. As Minton and McDonald have noted self-disclosure can affect the maintenance of one's gay identity--facilitative when interpersonal support is available, detrimental when such support is lacking. Regardless of the response, the person's perceptions of themselves will be altered by the disclosure process (Cass, 1979; de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978).

Although revealing one's sexual orientation may be an "all or none" phenomena for some gay persons, most "fluctuate back and forth in degrees of openness, depending on a variety of personal, social and professional factors" (de Monteflores & Schultz, 1978, p. 62). Richardson (1981) indicates that among lesbian women, there may be some circumstances where they choose to "pass" (that is, present a heterosexual front) rather than disclose their gay identity (for example, in the presence of one's grandparents). Summarizing the findings of a number of studies, Richardson (1981) states that "lesbians may themselves facilitate the process of passing by employing various strategies such as an avoidance of situations where homosexuality may be discussed, a conscious monitoring of the presentation of self and bodily image and the invention of a social life in keeping with a

heterosexual identity" (p. 123).

A recent empirical investigation of passing strategies among lesbian women confirmed Richardson's conclusions. Moses (1978) discovered that lesbians employed a variety of passing strategies in order to conceal their gay identities and to convincingly present a "heterosexual" facade. A majority of her respondents had introduced their "lover" as a "friend", avoided talking about their living situation, pretended to date men and used the pronoun "he" instead of "she" to refer to a female lover. Moses also found that women who were concerned about being gay-identified experienced some social situations with a sense of uneasiness and discomfort. Some of those situations were: having relatives to one's home, going alone to a straight party, going to a straight party with one's partner, and having a partner phone frequently at work.

The avoidance of social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation is pending might also be an aspect of gay male experience. Gay men might, therefore, also adopt passing strategies similar to those reported by Moses (1978) for lesbians. However, given the extent to which masculinity and heterosexual interest are expected to be actively demonstrated, gay males might have to employ such strategies to a greater extent than lesbians in order to present a convincing heterosexual front. Furthermore, males might evidence more anxiety in some social situations not perceived by lesbians as threatening.

In summary, self-disclosure represents a final step in achieving an integrated, personal identity. However, empirical data, from lesbian samples, suggest that self-disclosure is not an "all or none" phenomena and that a variety of passing strategies may be employed to conceal one's identity. The choice to do so is highly dependent upon how

the woman initially feels about being gay-identified in various social situations. At present, there are no empirical data to indicate what men do or avoid doing in order to pass, what situations they find uncomfortable, or the extent to which commitment to a "homosexual" or a "gay" identity affects management styles and passing strategies. The present investigation was undertaken to fill such a void.

The Measurement of Homosexual Identity

A major difficulty with any investigation of identity and identity management among homosexual men concerns the instrumentation utilized by researchers to measure identity. Traditionally, researchers have relied on a modified version of the Kinsey scale as a measure of sexual orientation (Morin, 1977). The scale, however, is limited in delineating individuals at various stages of identity development. Defining oneself as "exclusively" homosexual does not indicate to the researcher whether such persons feel guilty, anxious and ashamed or positively gay about such self-definitions. Furthermore, Kinsey's scale does not tap the underlying cognitive dimensions of sexual activity--sexual fantasies and need satisfaction are salient components of this cognitive domain. Given the fact that Kinsey studied acts, not persons, a question of fundamental importance in understanding the diversity of homosexual behaviors remains unanswered; that is, what do such activities signify for individual participants?

Recently, researchers have begun to apply Cass' (1979) model of identity to tap the various developmental stages (Elliott, 1981; Sommers, 1982). However, Cass (in press) has subsequently modified her model and Elliott (1981) and Sommers (1982) reported that there were

difficulties with her scale--a major one being a social-desirability response bias. Furthermore, as Sommers (1982) noted, researchers are unlikely to sample members of the gay community who have not achieved a sense of identity synthesis reflective of Cass' latter stages of identity development--a problem with any research on homosexuality regardless of what measures are employed.

Alternative approaches to measuring identity could rely less on how social scientists define gay men, and, instead, consider how these men define themselves. From this perspective, Nungesser (1979) discovered considerable variability among his gay male respondents when he asked them to rate themselves in relation to "being in the closet." The measure was a good predictor of the extent of homophobic prejudice reported, with more closeted men indicating higher levels of homophobia. In terms of using a language and a conceptual frame of reference familiar to the minority group under investigation, Nungesser's (1979) study represents a refreshing departure from the norm.

In a similar vein, researchers could begin to explore the various identities that gay men prefer, as self-descriptive, as possible predictors of identity management styles. For example, do men who prefer the term, "gay," differ in identity management from those who prefer other self-descriptive labels? Clearly, there is a need to examine how all identities (i.e., sexual preference, being in the closet, and preferred self-descriptive labels) relate to styles of identity management. Investigators have yet to determine which identities are the best predictors of identity management.

Purpose of the Present Investigation

The present investigation explored the various identities adopted by gay men and the extent to which such identities are related to styles of identity management. A major focus of this study involved an exploration of the extent to which individuals have achieved a congruent personal identity. Identity congruency refers to the integration of sexual behaviors, feelings, fantasies and self-image into one personal or valid identity. In contrast, someone whose sexual behavior, fantasies, feelings and self-image are not integrated would be maintaining a fragmented or incongruent personal identity. The kind of identity achieved has obvious implications for psychological adjustment.

Based on the literature review, one could conceptualize the following four groups of individuals, who differ in terms of their identity, management styles and levels of homophobic prejudice.²

Group 1. Men who engage in both heterosexual and homosexual activities but do not necessarily define themselves as homosexual. Their fantasies while maintaining sexual relations with women could be either "heterosexual" or "homosexual", but most often the latter. Inconspicuous sites (i.e., parking lots, bathhouses, highway rest stops) would be chosen for sexual encounters. Men in this group would assume certain sexual positions in order to preserve a "heterosexual" self-image. They would probably not allow kissing as an aspect of their sexual activities. They would probably report that they had not fallen in love with another

²The reader will note some similarities with Cass' (1979) model; however, it is not the researcher's intent to verify or substantiate this model with existing data. The groups proposed here should be viewed as a frame reference within which to explore the relationship between identity and identity management.

man. They would evidence extremely high levels of homophobic prejudice. As a personal or public identity as homosexual is denied, concerns about disclosure, passing, or awkwardness in social situations where the revealing of sexual orientation may be pending would not be an issue. Most, by virtue of their marital status, would present themselves as heterosexual and expect others to regard them as such.

Group 2. These men will have identified as "homosexual" but feel guilty or ashamed about such self-definitions. They may still engage in infrequent sexual encounters with women while maintaining "homosexual" erotic fantasies. Anonymous sexual contact may be adhered to in terms of the sites chosen for sexual encounters with other men. Unlike those in Group 1, these men would probably be sexually versatile and allow some kissing as an aspect of their sexual activities. They will most likely evidence extreme awkwardness in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending. They will engage in high degrees of passing and have internalized society's negative evaluation of homosexuals. In other words, there would be high levels of homophobic prejudice.

Group 3. These individuals have accepted a homosexual identity and feel relatively good about such an identification. They will have shared that aspect of themselves with some significant others. They would probably choose the term "gay" as opposed to "homosexual" as self-descriptive. Their own home or that of their partner's would be chosen as a site for sexual encounters. No sexual contact with women would be entertained. These men would have minor concerns about passing and feel

slightly uneasy in some social situations where the revealing of sexual orientation would be pending. They would report low levels of homophobic prejudice.

Group 4. Individuals in this group will choose to be gay-identified. They would report feeling positive about such a self-definition and regard disclosure as an "all or none" phenomena--a political statement to counteract societal discrimination of gay persons. Depending on the appropriateness of the situation, these men will be out to everyone--including the media. There will be no concern about passing. These men will report feeling at ease in situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending. There would be little or no evidence of homophobic prejudice.

In retrospect, the above groups of gay men differ in relation to their self-defined sexual preference (i.e., predominantly heterosexual to completely homosexual), the degree to which one is in the closet (i.e., from completely in to completely out), and the label chosen as self-descriptive (i.e., "homosexual", "gay" or "other"). In terms of achieving an optimal level of identity congruency (as in Group 4), respondents would be completely homosexual in terms of sexual preference, out of the closet and gay-identified. A major focus of the present research involves documenting the differences among the above groups with respect to varying levels of identity, identity management, and homophobic prejudice.

In brief, the present study will explore issues related to: (1) varying levels of identity among gay men; (2) age-related milestone experiences in the coming out process; (3) degree of disclosure and fears associated with greater degrees of openness; (4) reactions to

social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending; (5) passing strategies; (6) quality, extent, and satisfaction of sexual relations with both men and women; (7) place chosen for most frequent sexual encounters; (8) fantasies associated with sexual activities; and (9) homophobic attitudes toward self and group-identification.

Findings from this inquiry should provide data to either support or refute some of the theoretical propositions concerning homosexual identity formation and management. A study of this magnitude has not been formerly attempted. As the present research is largely exploratory in nature, no specific hypotheses have been formulated, rather expected findings are outlined.

Expected Findings

Given three levels of identity (i.e., sexual preference, being in the closet, and self-descriptive labels), expected differences would exist among respondents in terms of identity management and levels of homophobia. Those who are totally homosexual with respect to sexual orientation will differ from those who indicate that they are predominantly or mostly homosexual. Similarly, the more one is out of the closet the less likely they will be engaged in identity management strategies (i.e., attempts to pass). Those who choose the term "gay" as self-descriptive will differ from others by evidencing less homophobia.

In terms of the previously-described groups, expected differences would be apparent in relation to both identity congruency, styles of identity management, and levels of homophobic prejudice. As one advances from Group One through Four, a predictable pattern should be evident with Group Four indicating an optimal level of identity.

congruency. Therefore, it would be expected that members of this group would tend to be completely homosexual in relation to sexual preference, out of the closet and gay-identified. Presumably, assuming heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies while maintaining such an identity would be unlikely. Also, it would be expected that Group Four members would engage in fewer management strategies (i.e., less attempts at passing, etc.), and evidence lower levels of homophobic prejudice in comparison to other groups. In comparison to the other groups, Group Four members would have achieved an optimal degree of psychological adjustment.

In retrospect, the present investigation will explore three types of identity (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels and being in the closet), and their relationship to identity management, sexual behaviors/fantasies, and homophobic prejudice among gay men. Three general predictions are proposed. First, four distinct groups of respondents are expected to emerge. These groups are expected to differ in terms of their identity congruency, identity management, sexual behaviors/fantasies and degree of homophobic prejudice. Second, those respondents indicating that they are totally homosexual in terms of sexual preference, gay-identified and out of the closet will be closer than others to achieving an optimal level of identity congruency. As expected, these respondents will not be engaged in heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies. Third, those who are closer to achieving an optimal level of identity congruency will differ from others by indicating less concerns about identity management and evidencing lower levels of homophobic prejudice. In other words, they will be better adjusted in terms of integrating and managing a personal identity.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Sampling Procedure

Unlike others who share a minority status, most homosexual males are fairly invisible within the general population. This factor has rendered attempts at research with gay men somewhat difficult. In fact, some researchers have cautioned that given the pejorative attitudes toward homosexuality and the concomitant invisibility of gay men, we cannot refer to any research sample as truly representative of the overall homosexual population (McDonald & Moore, 1978; Morin, 1977). According to Gonsiorek (1982), the largest, single methodological problem faced by researchers has been how to define and obtain a representative sample of homosexual men. In a review of varying sampling sources employed by researchers, Gonsiorek has outlined the kinds of subject-selection bias that has typified most empirical investigations utilizing gay male subject pools. In reference to tapping gay bars, he notes that such samples are probably skewed toward the urban, young, extraverted, and those lacking a consistent sexual partner. Furthermore, "sources in the gay and lesbian communities estimate that the percentage of homosexuals who go to gay and lesbian bars with any frequency may be as low as 10 to 25 percent" (Gonsiorek, 1982, p. 63). He also indicates that gay liberation organizations tend to be comprised of relatively open and politically conscious individuals, while friendship networks inevitably attract persons similar in status to the researcher--that is,

white, middle-class, and educated.

In general, non-clinical samples of the gay male population have been comprised of individuals who have been relatively open about their sexual orientation--at least open enough to make themselves available for research purposes. The lack of access to a highly, visible closeted group of subjects has yielded scanty samples in this regard.

Furthermore, studies of closeted homosexuals (e.g., Humphreys, 1970) have relied almost exclusively on respondents who have been heterosexually married and not necessarily gay-identified. Finally, as many studies have involved volunteer subjects, many of whom most likely feel comfortable about their homosexual identities, it should not be assumed that such participants are representative of the overall homosexual population.

Given this myriad of sampling bias, one inevitably raises the question--is it possible to devise an adequate sample of gay research subjects? To begin with, it should be acknowledged that the problem of sampling bias is not specific to research with homosexual populations. Most research samples compiled by psychologists, because they have relied on university students, have tended to be young, white, middle-class, and educated (see Carlson, 1971). Secondly, some of the difficulties with gay subject-selection bias arise in choosing sampling sources that have been both conveniently accessible and respectable (i.e., gay bars, friendship networks, and gay liberation organizations). McDonald (1983) recommended that researchers should broaden their sampling sources in order to tap more diversified, heterogeneous populations of homosexual men.

In order to ensure such diversification and given the scope of the present investigation, it was decided that a variety of sampling sources

should be tapped. These include: gay baths, social clubs, gay liberation groups, friendship networks, a meeting of gay Protestants (the Metropolitan Community Church), a DIGNITY convention (gay Catholics), the association of lesbian and gay psychologists at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, and an AIDS forum. It was anticipated that these sampling sources would reach groups of individuals with divergent identities and experiences. Targeted groups were contacted in the following five cities: Winnipeg, Anaheim (California), Seattle, London (Ontario), and Windsor.

More than a dozen individuals assisted the researcher in the distribution of 1,200 survey packages. When forwarded to social clubs or baths, each package contained a letter of explanation outlining the intent and purpose of the research (Appendix A). Otherwise, a set of general instructions appeared on all questionnaire booklets (Appendix B). Prospective respondents were asked to forward completed responses by mail and to provide their own postage. The data collection occupied a period of three months and yielded a 20% overall return. Thirteen percent of the total received (32 out of 247) had to be disqualified due to the respondents' failure to follow instructions. The total usable sample was 215. A tabulated representation of the questionnaire distribution with regard to sampling sources appears in Appendix C.

Measures

Respondents were asked to complete the following measures (see Appendix D where the entire questionnaire is presented): demographic data (Questions 1-9, 12-14); sexual orientation (Question 10); a check-list of self descriptive labels (Question 11); extent to which the person views themselves as "in" or

"out" of the closet (Question 24); age-related milestone events in the coming out process (Questions 15-22); disclosure to significant others (Question 23); fears associated with greater degrees of openness (Questions 25-33); ease with which one interacts in social situations where the revealing of sexual orientation may be pending (Questions 48-70); passing strategies (Questions 71-87); frequency, quality, and involvement in sexual activities (Questions 88-101); and attitudes concerning homophobic prejudice (Questions 34-47 and 102-121).

Identity

In addition to assessing sexual orientation, two measures of identity were employed in the present investigation. One measure consisted of an adjective check-list with the following self-descriptive labels: straight, bisexual, homosexual, gay, none of these, or something else. The respondent was asked to choose one term which described themselves. On another measure, adopted from Nungesser (1979) and modified for the purposes of the present study, respondents were asked to describe themselves in relation to most people they knew. Choices ranged on a five-point scale from "definitely in the closet" to "completely out of the closet."

Coming Out Process

Respondents were asked to indicate the ages at which milestone events occurred in the coming out process (i.e., initial awareness of same-sex attractions, same-sex acts, initial exploration of the gay community, self-designation as homosexual, initial involvement in a long-term love relationship, self-disclosures to significant others, and acquiring a positive gay identity). The original scale was developed by

Kooden, Morin, Riddle, Rogers, Sang and Strassburger (1979) but has subsequently been modified for use in the present study with the addition of an item asking the age at which respondents first began associating with other gay men (i.e., going to bars, clubs, parties, etc.). These responses provide a chronological overview of identity development.

Disclosure to Significant Others

Disclosure of sexual orientation to significant others was measured on a scale initially developed by Weinberg and Williams (1974). Lindquist (1976) modified the scale and it is this modified version that has been employed in the present investigation. Respondents were asked to check those significant others who "definitely knew" about the person's homosexual activities or identity. Each check-mark is assigned a score of one. Respondents' overall scores could range from 0 to 12. Low scores would indicate that the person suspects few significant others know about his homosexual identity, whereas high scores indicate the reverse.

Fears about Increased Openness

Fears concerned with greater degrees of openness was assessed on an 8-item scale developed by Kooden et al. (1979). Unlike Kooden's measure, the present one utilized a scoring procedure that tapped the degree of fear associated with each item. Respondents were asked to indicate for each item, on a five-point scale, whether the situation is "important" or "not at all important" to them. Scores could range from eight to 40 with higher scores indicating more fears associated with anticipated openness. In addition, respondents were asked to list any other fears

not appearing on the 8-item scale.

Social Situations

The ease with which one interacts in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending was assessed on a 23-item scale adapted from Moses (1978). Although Moses treated each situation as a single entity, taken together, a composite score could be derived that reflected the respondent's degree of anxiety or comfort across all situations. Respondents are asked to indicate for each item whether they felt comfortable or uneasy imagining themselves in the situation so described. Choices ranged on a five-point scale from "not uncomfortable" to "extremely uncomfortable". Scores could range from 23 to 115 with higher scores indicating higher levels of discomfort in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation might be pending.

For the purpose of the present investigation, eight new items were added to the scale and these included: attending a family gathering alone, attending a family gathering with your lover, attending a close heterosexual friend's wedding alone, attending a close heterosexual friend's wedding with your lover, hearing "straights" tell a homosexual joke, telling a homosexual joke to "straights", filling out an application form that requests marital status information, and having a job interview where one's marital status is discussed. The entire scale appears in Appendix D, questions 48-70.

Passing Strategies

Seventeen questions concerned with active attempts to conceal one's sexual preference and present a heterosexual front have been adapted

from Moses' (1978) study of passing among lesbian women. Although Moses treated each incidence of passing as a separate entity, the scale could be used to provide an overall score of the extent of passing among gay men. Respondents were asked to check those activities that they had engaged in during the past six months. Scores could range from 0 to 17 with higher scores indicating more attempts to pass.

In the present investigation, two items were added to the scale and these were: 'hiding gay books and records when straight friends or relatives come to visit, and asking your lover to leave your home or pretend to be a visitor when straight friends drop over. The entire scale is presented in Appendix D, questions 71-87.

Sexual Activities

A number of questions that tapped the frequency, extent, and quality of sexual activities were adapted and modified from studies conducted by Jay and Young (1979), Spada (1979), and Weinberg and Williams (1974). These questions also included the affectional and emotive aspects of sexual behavior as well as levels of fantasizing (see Appendix D, questions 88-101). Respondents are asked to indicate where sexual contact takes place, past and current sexual experiences with women, fantasies involved, and the degree of sexual and emotional commitment in contact with men. In the present investigation, these questions were used as a measure of the extent to which the respondent had achieved identity congruency.

Attitudes toward Homophobic Prejudice

Nungesser's (1979) Homosexual Attitudes Inventory (NHAI) was employed in the present investigation as a measure of attitudes toward

self and group-identification as homosexual. Nungesser considers the scale a good measure of the extent to which gay men have internalized the negative sentiment surrounding male homosexuality so prevalent in North America. The NHAI is comprised of 34 items which can be broken down into three separate subscales. Subscale A consists of 10 items that tap attitudes toward homosexuality as an aspect of the self. Subscale B also contains 10 items and is a measure of the respondents' attitudes toward male homosexuals as a reference group. Subscale C is a measure of attitudes regarding the extent to which one is known as homosexual in the presence of others. It consists of 14 items. In brief, the NHAI yields an overall score and three subscale scores.

The NHAI is constructed in Likert-type fashion so that half the statements contain a negative evaluation of male homosexuals while others are positively-worded. Respondents are asked on a five-point scale to "strongly disagree" or "strongly agree" with each statement. In scoring, responses to negative items are added, the sign of sum reversed, then added to the sum of positive statements. The subjects' possible overall score could range from 34 to 170. Scores on subscales A and B could range from 10 to 50; while scores on subscale C could range from 14 to 70. In all instances, high scores indicate positive attitudes toward male homosexuality and low levels of homophobic prejudice. According to Nungesser, someone scoring low would be more likely to regard his homosexual identity as a private matter not to be shared with others. In comparison to high scores, these individuals would evidence greater levels of homophobic prejudice by endorsing more negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Indices of reliability and validity have been established (Nungesser, 1979; Sommers, 1982). The three subscales of the NHAI with scoring keys are presented in Appendix E.

Summary

In retrospect, three measures of identity were employed in the present investigation (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels, and being in or out of the closet). For the most part, these three identities were treated as independent variables.

The dependent variables consisted of the following measures: disclosure to significant others, fears associated with greater degrees of openness, ease/discomfort in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending, passing strategies, milestone events in the coming out process, sexual behaviors and fantasies, and attitudes concerning homophobic prejudice. From these dependent measures, four scales were chosen to tap various aspects of identity management. These included: disclosure to significant others, fears associated with greater degrees of openness, ease/discomfort in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending and passing strategies. Homophobic prejudice was measured on three subscales of the NHAI. Measures of sexual behavior and fantasies were chosen as an aspect of the extent to which respondents had achieved a sense of identity congruency. Finally, milestone events in the coming out process provided further information concerning the developmental sequence of chosen identities and respondents commitment to them (i.e., glad to be gay).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results are presented in five sections. Section One consists of a description of the subjects in relation to demographic characteristics. Section Two presents an analysis of the three independent variables--sexual preference, self-descriptive labels, and the extent to which respondents reported being "in" or "out" of the closet. Section Three reports descriptive statistics for all dependent variables employed in the present investigation. Relationships among the dependent variables and the three independent variables are also analyzed. Discriminant function analyses for each of the three independent variables across the battery of dependent variables are presented in Section Four. A summary of major findings appears in Section Five.

Section One

Description of the Sample

The total sample consisted of 215 males, ranging in age from 16 to 64 with a mean age of 35 years. The largest category (35%) held graduate degrees and reported an average income between \$25,000-\$29,000.

In terms of occupation, most respondents held positions that were classified as professional or semi-professional. Eighteen percent were students at the time of the survey and 17% were unemployed. Ninety-five percent of the sample was white. In reference to religious affiliation, one-third of the respondents indicated that they were

Catholic and a similar percentage designated a Protestant affiliation. The remainder reported "other" or "no" religion. In terms of marital status, 87% reported being single; however, 25% reported living with a male life-partner. Forty-seven percent were living alone at the time of the survey. Of those respondents who were heterosexually married, divorced, separated or widowed (N = 28), two percent were living with their children. A detailed description of the range of the respondent's age, educational level, income, occupation, religious affiliation, and current living situation are presented in Appendix F.

In terms of "representativeness", the present sample tended to be older and more educated than most non-clinical samples of gay men (see Gonsiorek, 1982). Respondents also tended to be clustered into white-collar and professional occupations. Similar to other non-clinical samples with respect to race, the present one was predominantly white.

Section Two

Sexual Preference, Self-preferred Labels and Being in the Closet

There were three measures of identity employed in the present investigation (sexual preference, self-descriptive labels, and the extent to which respondents were "in" or "out" of the closet). Complete scores for respondents on these three measures are presented in Appendix G. In terms of sexual preference, 71% (N = 153) indicated that they considered themselves "totally homosexual". Twenty-one percent (N = 46) rated themselves as "predominantly homosexual" while seven percent (N = 15) indicated they were more homosexual than heterosexual. In terms of preferred labels, 79% (N = 170) of the present sample choose "gay" as most preferred. Twelve percent (N = 26) choose the term "homosexual" as

self-descriptive. The remaining nine percent ($N = 19$) were dispersed throughout four remaining categories: "straight", "bisexual", "none", and "other". In relation to being in the closet, respondents' scores reflected considerable variability. Thirty-six percent ($N = 79$) considered themselves to be "mostly" out of the closet, with 26% ($N = 56$) indicating that they were "completely out".

It had been predicted that most respondents would indicate simultaneously that they were totally homosexual in terms of sexual preference, gay-identified and completely out of the closet. In order to explore this prediction, crosstabulations and correlation coefficients were computed. Three 2×2 contingency tables were constructed for preference \times label, preference \times closet, and label \times closet. (See Tables 1 through 3, respectively). Chi-square analysis indicated significance for preference \times label ($\chi^2 (1) = 8.81, p < .003$), and label \times closet ($\chi^2 (2) = 15.98, p < .001$). In order to reexamine these relationships, respondents were broken down into four closet groups. Crosstabulations were then recalculated for preference \times label. This procedure yielded four 2×2 contingency tables. (See Table 4). Chi-square analysis indicated significance only for those respondents who were "in" to "mostly in" the closet ($\chi^2 (1) = 9.84, p < .001$). These results partially confirm what had been predicted. Respondents who are out of the closet tended to label themselves "gay". The prediction that these same respondents would also tend to describe themselves as "totally homosexual" in terms of sexual preference was not confirmed.

Correlation coefficients were then computed among preference, label and closet. Reflecting the findings of the previous chi-square analysis,

Table 1

Chi-square Analysis: Preference x Label

Preference	Label		Row Total
	Others	Gay	
Predominantly homosexual	21	41	62
Totally homosexual	24	129	153
Column total	45	170	

$$\chi^2 = 8.81$$

$$df = 1$$

$$p < .003$$

Table 2

Chi-square Analysis: Preference x Closet

Preference	Closet		Row total
	In to mostly in	Mostly out to completely out.	
Predominantly homosexual	25	36	62
Totally homosexual	54	99	153
Column total	79	135	

$$\chi^2 = 3.08$$

$$df = 2$$

$$p < .21$$

Table 3

Chi-square Analysis: Label x Closet

Label	Closet		Row total
	In to mostly in	Mostly out to completely out	
Others	28	17	45
Gay	52	118	170
Column total	80	135	

$$\chi^2 = 15.98$$

$$df = 2$$

$$p < .0003$$

Table 4

Chi-square Analysis: Preference x Label x ClosetIn to Mostly In the Closet (N = 36)

Preference	Label		Row Total
	Others	Gay	
Predominantly homosexual	8	2	10
Totally homosexual	6	20	26
Column total	14	22	

$\chi^2 = 9.84$

df = 1

$p < .001$

Half In and Half Out (N = 43)

Preference	Label		Row Total
	Others	Gay	
Predominantly homosexual	7	8	15
Totally homosexual	7	21	28
Column total	14	29	

$\chi^2 = 2.08$

df = 1

$p < .14$

Table continues

Table 4 continued

Mostly Out (N = 79)

Preference	Label		Row Total
	Others	Gay	
Predominantly homosexual	5	16	21
Totally homosexual	7	51	58
Column total	12	67	

$$\chi^2 = 1.64$$

$$df = 1$$

$$p < .19$$

Completely Out (N = 56)

Preference	Label		Row Total
	Others	Gay	
Predominantly homosexual	1	14	15
Totally homosexual	4	37	41
Column total	5	51	

$$\chi^2 = .12$$

$$df = 1$$

$$p < .71$$

label correlated with both preference ($r = .20, p < .003$) and closet ($r = .25, p < .001$)

Section Three

Dependent Variables

The following section presents the overall scores on the dependent variables employed in the present investigation. The dependent measures included: milestone events in the coming out process, disclosure to significant others, fears associated with greater degrees of openness, ease/discomfort in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending, passing strategies, sexual behavior and fantasies, and attitudes concerning homophobic prejudice. As a primary focus of the present investigation involved documenting styles of identity management and levels of homophobic prejudice, the means and standard deviations for these measures are presented first. A measure of identity management consisted of: disclosure to significant others (Score I), fears associated with greater degrees of openness (Score II), ease/discomfort in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending (Score III), and passing strategies (Score IV).

Disclosure to Significant Others: Score I

Respondents were asked to check those significant others who definitely "knew about" the person's homosexual identity and/or sexual activities. Respondent's mean score on this measure was 4.74, with a standard deviation of 2.93. Scores ranged from 0 to 10. These scores indicate that most respondents felt that some significant others knew about their sexual orientation. Twenty-three percent ($N = 49$) indicated that they were open to the media and public at large, while six percent

(N = 13) reported that no one knew about their homosexual identity. Those significant others checked by respondents as "knowing" about the person's sexual orientation appear in Table 5.

Fears Associated with Greater Openness: Score II

Respondent's mean score on this 8-item measure was 16.08, with a standard deviation of 6.66. Scores ranged from 2 to 38. Concerns about job/income loss and endangering job credibility were ranked as first in importance. Twenty-four percent of the sample considered both as "very important" in terms of keeping them from being more open about their sexual orientation. Those fears that were listed as "not at all important" were concerns about legal entanglement and the loss of friendship. In reference to the former, 62% were not worried, while 45% indicated no fears about the latter. When asked to list other fears not included on the 8-item measure, 80% of the respondents listed no other fears; however, five percent listed physical harassment, while six percent indicated a concern with overall social rejection.

Social Situations: Score III

In reference to social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending, respondents indicated a mean score of 39.79 with a standard deviation of 13.55. Scores ranged from 12 to 101. Of the 23 items, four items elicited extreme discomfort. Twenty-three percent of the sample (N = 50) indicated that "telling a homosexual joke to straights" would be extremely uncomfortable. Seventeen percent revealed that hearing such a joke from others would be bothersome. The other two items were: "attending a family gathering with a lover" (14% would be extremely uncomfortable) and "going to a straight party with one's lover" (13% indicated extreme discomfort).

Table 5

Significant Others Listed as Knowing About Respondent's Sexual
Orientation

<u>Significant Others</u>	<u>Percentage Listed as Knowing</u>
Mother	53
Father	34
Brother(s)	44
Sister(s)	47
Wife (N = 16)	8
Children (N = 5)	2
Relatives	35
Male friend	62
Female friend	63
Employer	32
Co-worker	72
Media (N = 49)	23

Passing Strategies: Score IV

In terms of passing, 25% (N = 53) indicated no attempts to pass as heterosexual. For the remaining sample, the mean score was 2.21 with a standard deviation of 2.08. Scores ranged from 1 to 11. Four items in particular were frequently chosen as attempts to pass. Forty-seven percent of the present respondents (N = 102) indicated they hid gay books or records when straight friends or relatives visited their homes. Forty-four percent (N = 94) introduced their lover or partner as a "friend", while 32% (N = 68) used the pronoun "she" instead of "he" to refer to a gay male roommate, friend or lover. Finally, 30% of the sample (N = 64) avoided any personal talk about their living situation. A few respondents (14%) indicated that they invited a woman as their "date" to social functions, while 12% (N = 25) stated that they pretended to date women.

Attitudes Toward Homophobic Prejudice: Scores V-VII

On Nungesser's Homosexual Attitudes Inventory (NHA), respondents reported an overall mean score of 131 with a standard deviation of 19.34. Scores ranged from 63 to 169. The mean score for the disclosure subscale was 50.41 with a standard deviation of 11.14. Scores ranged from 20 to 70. On the "self" subscale--a measure of one's attitudes about being homosexual, respondents indicated a mean score of 41.5 with a standard deviation of 6.33. Scores ranged from 16 to 50. On the "other" subscale--a measure of attitudes about homosexuals as a reference group, present respondents reported a mean score of 39.07 with a standard deviation of 5.73. Scores ranged from 23 to 50. These scores are highly similar to those reported for gay male respondents in

both Mungesser's (1978) and Sommers (1983) investigations.

A summary of the means and standard deviations for identity management and homophobic prejudice scores appear in Table 6.

Milestone Events in the Coming Out Process

Participants in the present investigation reported an awareness of same-sex feelings at an average age of 13, with first sexual experience and understanding the word "homosexual" occurring simultaneously two years later. Self-labelling occurred at an average age of 21, with initial exploration of the gay community evolving three years later. Disclosure of sexual orientation to a significant nongay-other took place at an average age of 25, four years after self-labelling. Eight percent of the sample indicated that they had not disclosed their sexual orientation to anyone other than another known gay person. Respondents entered their first long-term relationship with another male at the average of 26. Sixteen percent of the present respondents indicated that they had never experienced such a relationship. Respondents also reported acquiring a positive gay identity (i.e., were glad to be gay) at an average age of 27, six years after self-labelling had occurred. Fourteen percent of the sample indicated that they had not acquired a positive gay identity. On the average, a 14-year period had elapsed from the time respondents became aware of same-sex feelings to the point of viewing themselves as positively gay-identified. Table 7 presents the means and standard deviation for these milestone events. These results are similar to those reported by McDonald (1982) in an earlier investigation of individual differences in the coming out process.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for Major Dependent Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Score I:</u> Significant others "knowing" of respondent's sexual orientation	4.74	2.93
<u>Score II:</u> Fears associated with greater openness	16.08	6.66
<u>Score III:</u> Social situations	39.79	13.55
<u>Score IV:</u> Passing strategies	2.21	2.08
<u>Score V:</u> NHAI-disclosure subscale	50.41	11.14
<u>Score VI:</u> NHAI-self subscale	41.51	6.33
<u>Score VII:</u> NHAI-other subscale	39.07	5.73

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Milestone Events

<u>Event</u>	<u>Mean Age of Occurrence</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Awareness of same-sex attractions	12.6	5.62
Same-sex acts and experiences	14.5	7.59
Understood what the word "homosexual" meant	14.7	4.25
Self-designation as homosexual	20.7	6.63
Initial exploration of the gay community	24	7.05
Involved in first long-term love relationship (N = 181)	25.7	6.58
Initial disclosure to significant non-gay other (N = 196)	24.8	7.3
See self as having positive gay identity (N = 186)	26.7	7.98

Sexual Activities

On the average, respondents indicated that they had sexual relations several times a week. Thirty-four percent of the sample (N = 74) showed such a pattern, though 20% (N = 45) indicated having such relations several times a month. Seventeen percent (N = 37) had sexual contact only once a month.

The majority of respondents (N = 181) engaged in sexual relations in their home or that of their partner's (N = 110). Twenty-six percent (N = 56) checked "gay bathhouse" as a favored sexual environment, while 17% (N = 38) chose a hotel for such encounters. Sites least likely to be chosen included: the beach, park, restroom, camper, woods, peepshow, and bar.

In terms of activity level, 50% of the sample (N = 108) were as physically active during sex as their partners. Thirty-two percent (N = 69) were more active, while 16% (N = 35) were less active. In terms of asking one's partner what sexual activities to engage in, 44% (N = 95) did not ask often, while 43% (N = 92) frequently or always asked.

In reference to emotional involvement, 89% (N = 191) preferred kissing during their encounters, with 10% (N = 23) indicating that kissing was infrequently chosen. Ninety-two percent of the respondents (N = 198) stated that they had been in love with another man, eight percent (N = 17) said "no" or were "not sure." A majority of the sample (N = 202) had danced "slow" dances with another male, six percent (N = 13) had never had such an experience.

When asked about sexual fantasizing, 80% of the sample (N = 173) indicated that they did not think about women while having sexual

relations with men. Twelve percent ($N = 27$) said on a few occasions they had, while two percent ($N = 5$) indicated that they often did. In terms of thinking about men while having sexual contact with women, 55% ($N = 117$) stated that they did not have sexual relations with women. Of those who did, 16% ($N = 36$) indicated that they did not think about men; 15% ($N = 33$) had done so a few times. Eight percent ($N = 18$) said that they often did. When asked about current sexual relations with women, 94% ($N = 201$) indicated that they were not having such relations. When asked about such relations occurring in the past, 43% ($N = 92$) stated they never had, but 31% ($N = 67$) said "yes, a few times" with 17% ($N = 37$) responding "yes, often." Only nine respondents indicated that they were legally married to a woman at the time of the survey and eight of these respondents felt somewhat or completely dissatisfied with their marriage.

In terms of sexual activities per se, the majority of respondents engaged in a wide variety of sexual activities. Differences did occur, however, with masturbation and both the insertor and receptive aspects of anal intercourse. On all three activities, 16% ($N = 34$) of the sample indicated abstinence. When asked to describe their overall level of satisfaction while having sexual relations with men, 88% ($N = 191$) of the respondents reported that they were completely or somewhat satisfied. Six percent ($N = 14$) were neutral, while four percent indicated complete dissatisfaction.

The Correlational Relationships Among Dependent Variables

In order to explore the relationship among dependent variables, a correlation matrix was constructed. This matrix appears in Appendix H.

In constructing this correlation table, dependent variables were given abbreviated notations. Although it may seem self-evident what some of these abbreviations represent, a code has been provided in Appendix I in order to clarify their meanings.

A number of significant patterns emerged from the correlational analysis. Of particular concern for the present investigation were the high correlations among identity management and homophobic prejudice scores (see Appendix H, p. 144). Score I (disclosure to significant others) correlated with Score V (NHAI-disclosure subscale) ($r = .63$, $p < .001$). Scores on the homophobic prejudice scales were highly interrelated. Score V correlated with Score VI (self subscale) ($r = .51$, $p < .001$) and Score VII (other subscale) ($r = .45$, $p < .001$). Score VI and Score VII were also correlated ($r = .57$, $p < .001$).

Demographic variables correlated with milestone events. In particular, age, income, occupation and marital status were correlated with WORDHOMO, SELFHOMO, GOGAYBAR, and TOLDSMNE (see Appendix H, p. 131). Milestone events were also correlated with identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. TOLDSMNE and GLADGAY were the two major variables involved in these correlations (see Appendix H, p. 138). In terms of sexual activities, PASTSEX was related to both THINKMAN and THINKWOM. Also, SLOWDANC correlated with TOGETHER, DOANAL and HAVANAL (see Appendix H, p. 142). Finally, some of the sexual activities correlated with identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. TOGETHER, DOANAL, HAVANAL, and PASTSEX all correlated with Score I (significant others chosen for disclosure). SLOWDANC correlated with Scores V, VI and VII (see Appendix H, p. 143).

The Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables

A final analysis involved correlations between the three independent variables (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels, and the extent to which respondents were "in" or "out" of the closet) and the dependent measures. These correlations are presented in Table 8. Sexual preference correlated with MARITAL ($r = -.16, p < .01$), THINKWOM ($r = -.31, p < .001$), THINKMAN ($r = -.38, p < .001$), PASTSEX ($r = .27, p < .001$), and Score VI (NHAI self subscale) ($r = .17, p < .001$). Both self-preferred labels and being in the closet were highly correlated with all the identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. In addition, GLADGAY was highly correlated with self-preferred labels and being in the closet. There were some minor correlations among being in the closet and sexual activities, such as: TOGETHER, DOANAL, and HAVANAL.

Section Four

Discriminating Among Groups

A major focus of the present investigation involved the extent to which various identities could differentiate respondents in terms of identity management and levels of homophobic prejudice. In order to explore this, a discriminant analysis was undertaken for each independent variable (i.e., three identities) across all dependent variables.

Discriminant analysis identifies those discriminating variables (i.e., dependent variables) which differentiate the groups under investigation. The variables can be analyzed simultaneously or in subsets. Standardized coefficients are generated for each variable. These coefficients are similar to factor loadings in factor analysis

Table 8

Correlations Among Identity Measures and All Other Variables

Dependent variable	Preference	Label	Closet
Age	.04	-.05	-.13
Education	.03	-.04	-.05
Income	-.01	-.10	-.15
Marital	-.16*	-.03	-.08
Currently	-.06	.04	-.02
Occupation	-.11	-.14	-.18*
Student	-.02	-.05	-.15
Firstsex	.03	.01	-.10
Feelings	-.01	0.06	-.12
Wordhomo	.02	-.01	-.11
Selfhomo	.00	.02	-.14
Gogaybar	.10	.05	-.11
Relationship	-.10	.00	-.02
Toldsmne	-.02	-.07	-.22*
Gladgay	.12	.22**	.42**
Othrfear	.01	-.01	.00
Howoften	.05	-.07	-.16*
Home	.03	.12	.10
Partners	-.06	-.02	.01
Gaybath	-.09	-.03	.02

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Table continues

Table 8 continued

Dependent variable	Preference	Label	Closet
Hotel	-.10	-.03	-.09
Moractiv	.00	.06	.03
Askprtnr	-.02	.02	-.06
Slowdanc	.00	-.16*	-.21*
Thinkwom	-.31**	-.13	-.04
Thinkman	-.38**	-.24**	.01
Feelsex	-.02	-.04	.00
Together	-.05	.02	.17*
Doanal	-.02	.21**	.15*
Havanal	.00	.09	.15*
Pastsex	.27**	.10	-.04
Score I	-.07	.23**	.59**
Score II	-.10	-.28**	-.22**
Score III	-.10	-.16*	-.23**
Score IV	-.07	-.26**	-.36**
Score V	.10	.31**	.57**
Score VI	.17**	.40**	.32**
Score VII	.11	.38**	.25**

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

in that they represent the relative contribution of each variable. An overall score is given which represents differences between groups evaluated at the group means (i.e., the group centroids). Eigenvalues and chi-square scores indicate whether differences between groups are significant. A classification table is provided that indicates the percentage of predicted group membership that was correctly classified.

When four groups are involved in the analysis, three sets of coefficients (referred to as discriminant functions) are computed. These functions are presented in descending order of importance. Therefore, differences between group means on the second or third function are not as meaningful as differences on the first function (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, & Bent, 1975). Eigenvalues and chi-square scores indicate whether differences between group means are significant for each function. ³

Sexual Preference

Respondents were divided into two groups based on sexual preference. These groups consisted of those who were totally homosexual (N = 153) and the remainder of the sample (N = 62). Discriminant function analysis for sexual preference across all dependent measures is presented in Table 9. When all variables are entered into the analysis, significant differences between the two preference groups emerged (eigenvalue = .52, $\chi^2 = 67.75$, $p < .001$). When the variables were broken into subsets, those variables concerned with sexual activities and fantasies were able to differentiate the two groups (see Subset 2, Table 9). In particular, the highest values on standardized coefficients were found for THINKWOM (do you think about women while having sexual relations with men?) and THINKMAN (do you think about men while having

Table 9

Discriminant Functions for Preference

<u>Dependent variables</u>	<u>Standardized coefficients¹</u>			
	<u>All variables</u>	<u>Subset 1</u>	<u>Subset 2</u>	<u>Subset 3</u>
Age	.05	-.10		
Educa	-.08	-.08		
Incom	-.24	-.29		
Marital	.08	.60		
Currentlv	.03	.08		
Occupa	.44	.69		
Student	.00	.03		
Firstsex	.12	.09		
Feelings	-.12	-.07		
Wordhomo	.01	.04		
Selfhomo	.00	.00		
Gogaybar	-.39	-.66		
Rlttnship	.06	.33		
Toldsmne	.24	.26		
Gladgay	-.18	-.24		
Howoften	.00		.07	
Home	-.01		-.10	
Partners	.14		.23	
Gaybath	-.10		-.03	
Hotel	.15		.13	
Moractiv	-.10		-.09	
Askprtnr	.19		.21	
Slowdanc	-.02		-.05	
Thinkwom	.51		.56	
Thinkman	.53		.61	
Feelsex	-.06		-.04	
Together	.00		-.03	
Doanal	-.02		.08	
Havanal	-.16		-.21	
Pastsex	-.32		-.34	
Othrfeare	-.17			-.15
Score I	.09			.96
Score II	-.08			.31
Score III	.05			.09
Score IV	-.05			.06
Score V	-.04			-.58
Score VI	-.12			-.40
Score VII	.08			-.11

Table continues

Table 9 continued

Dependent variables	Standardized coefficients ¹			
	<u>All variables</u>	<u>Subset 1</u>	<u>Subset 2</u>	<u>Subset 3</u>
Groups				
Mostly homo	1.09	.58	.92	.42
Totally homo	-.44	-.23	-.37	-.17
Eigenvalue:	.49	.13	.34	.07
χ^2	77.88**	26.58	61.26**	15.15

** $p < .001$

¹For emphasis, coefficients of .5 or greater have been underlined.

sexual relations with women?). Mean scores on these two variables indicated that individuals who rate their sexual preference as totally homosexual are less likely to engage in heterosexual erotic fantasies. t-tests further substantiate the significant differences between sexual preference groups in this regard. (See Table 17).

In terms of predicting group membership, 75% were correctly classified when all the variables were considered. When only variables related to sexual activities and fantasies were analyzed (i.e., Subset 2), 74% of the predicted group membership was correctly classified. These classification tables are presented in Table 10.

Self-preferred Labels

Respondents were divided into those who were gay-identified (N = 170) and the remainder of the sample (N = 45). Discriminant function analysis for self-preferred label across all dependent variables is presented in Table 11. When all variables are entered into the analysis, significant differences between the two groups emerged (eigenvalue = .54, $\chi^2 = 84.95$, $p < .001$). When variables were clustered into subsets, those variables concerned with sexual activities and fantasies (i.e., Subset 2) and those related to identity management and homophobic prejudice (i.e., Subset 3) were able to differentiate the two groups. In Subset 2, the highest values on standardized coefficients were found for THINKMAN (do you ever think about men while having sexual relations with women?) and DOANAL (assume an insertor role in anal intercourse). Mean scores on these two variables indicate that gay-identified respondents were less likely to think about men if engaged in sexual relations with women, and more likely than others to assume an insertor role in anal intercourse. t-tests further

Table 10

Classification Tables for Preference

<u>Actual group</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>	<u>Predicted group membership</u>		<u>Percent correctly classified</u>
		<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	
Group 1: Mostly homosexual	62	45	17	77%
Group 2: Totally homosexual	153	33	120	
<u>Subset 1</u>				
Group 1: Mostly homosexual	62	34	28	66%
Group 2: Totally homosexual	153	46	107	
<u>Subset 2</u>				
Group 1: Mostly homosexual	62	38	24	74%
Group 2: Totally homosexual	153	33	120	
<u>Subset 3</u>				
Group 1: Mostly homosexual	62	37	25	64%
Group 2: Totally homosexual	153	58	95	

Table 11

Discriminant Functions for Label

Dependent variables	Standardized Coefficients ¹			
	All variables	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3
Age	-.05	-.04		
Educa	.04	-.03		
Incom	-.12	-.26		
Marital	.16	-.10		
Curentlv	.13	.19		
Occupa	-.11	-.36		
Student	.20	.16		
Firstsex	.04	.15		
Feelings	-.05	-.28		
Wordhomo	-.16	-.01		
Selfhomo	.08	.10		
Gogaybar	.19	.34		
Rlttnship	.08	.06		
Toldsame	-.01	.11		
Gladgay	-.07	.67		
Howoften	.03		.18	
Home	.20		-.25	
Partners	-.05		.14	
Gaybath	.07		.00	
Hotel	.05		-.02	
Moractiv	.27		-.35	
Askprtnr	.16		-.09	
Slowdanc	-.11		.32	
Thinkwom	-.07		.33	
Thinkman	-.37		.57	
Feelsex	.20		-.14	
Together	-.11		.00	
Doanal	.33		-.54	
Havanal	-.12		.02	
Pastsex	.16		-.08	
Othrfear	-.05			-.07
Score I	.23			.06
Score II	-.16			-.31
Score III	.04			.10
Score IV	-.24			-.20
Score V	-.11			.06
Score VI	.39			.47
Score VII	.31			.41

Table continues

Table 11 continues

Dependent variables	Standardized Coefficients ¹			
	All variables	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3
Groups				
Others	-1.43	-.59	.82	-1.07
Gay-identified	.37	.15	-.21	.28
Eigenvalue:	.54	.09	.18	.30
χ^2 :	84.95**	18.82	34.71*	56.00**

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$ ¹For emphasis, coefficients of .5 or greater have been underlined.

substantiate the significant differences between "label" groups on these two variables. (See Table 17).

On Subset 3, the highest standardized coefficients were found for Score VI--Nungesser's self subscale and Score VII--Nungesser's other subscale (eigenvalue = .30, $\chi^2 = 56.00$, $p < .001$). Mean scores on these two homophobic prejudice subscales indicate that gay-identified respondents, in comparison to others, have more positive attitudes toward both themselves as homosexual and their own reference group. Again, t-tests confirm the significance of this finding. (See Table 17).

In terms of predicting group membership, 83% were correctly classified when all variables were analyzed. When only those variables related to sexual activities and fantasies were entered (i.e., Subset 2), 71% of the predicted group membership was correctly classified. For Subset 3 (identity management and homophobic prejudice scores, 78% of the predicted group membership was correctly classified. These classification results appear in Table 12.

In and Out of the Closet

Given the uneven distribution with respect to how respondents had rated themselves in reference to being in the closet (i.e., the sample was skewed with those who were mostly to completely out), the final independent variable--being in the closet--was analyzed in two ways. First, a discriminant function analysis was computed with two groups. Group 1 comprised all those respondents who were "in" to "half in" and "half out" of the closet ($N = 79$). The second group consisted of those who were "mostly out" to "completely out" of the closet ($N = 135$). The other major discriminant function analysis involved four closet groups

Table 12

Classification Tables for Label

<u>Actual group</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>	<u>Predicted group membership</u>		<u>Percent correctly classified</u>
		<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	
Group 1: Others	45	36	9	83%
Group 2: Gay-identified	170	27	143	
<u>Subset 1</u>				
Group 1: Others	45	23	22	68%
Group 2: Gay-identified	170	46	124	
<u>Subset 2</u>				
Group 1: Others	45	27	18	71%
Group 2: Gay-identified	170	45	125	
<u>Subset 3</u>				
Group 1: Others	45	31	14	78%
Group 2: Gay-identified	170	34	136	

rather than two. Both sets of findings are presented here.

Discriminant function analysis for two closet groups across all dependent variables are presented in Table 13. When all variables are entered into the analysis, significant differences emerge, with the highest standardized coefficient appearing on one variable--Score I (significant others listed as knowing about the person's sexual orientation). When subsets were analyzed, Subset 1 (variables related to demographic and age-related milestone events) and Subset 3 (identity management and homophobic prejudice) were able to differentiate the two groups. On Subset 1, the highest coefficients were found for one major variable: GLADGAY (at what age were you glad to be gay?). On Subset 3, the highest coefficient was found for Score I. Mean scores for the two closet groups indicate that the more one is out of the closet, the more significant others are listed as knowing about the person's sexual orientation, and the more one is likely to report that they are "glad to be gay." These differences appear to be significant (see Table 17).

In terms of predicting group membership, 83% were correctly classified when all variables were analyzed. When only variables related to Subset 1 and Subset 3 were entered, 71% of the predicted group membership was correctly classified for the latter, while 82% was correctly classified for the former. These classification results appear in Table 14.

When four closet groups were analyzed, there were similar findings in terms of which subsets of variables were able to discriminate among groups. Table 15 presents the discriminant functions for four closet groups across all dependent variables. When all variables are entered

Table 13

Discriminant Functions for Closet: Two Groups

Dependent variables	Standardized coefficients ¹			
	All variables	Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3
Age	.17	.00		
Educa	-.18	-.10		
Incom	-.13	-.07		
Marital	-.10	-.01		
Curentlv	-.03	-.03		
Occupa	-.04	-.19		
Student	-.07	-.05		
Firstsex	-.10	-.21		
Feelings	.08	.04		
Wordhomo	.12	.14		
Selfhomo	-.17	-.29		
Gogaybar	.03	-.11		
Rltship	-.15	-.18		
Toldsmne	.03	.22		
Gladgay	.33	.84		
Howoften	-.16		.42	
Home	-.06		-.13	
Partners	-.11		.00	
Gaybath	.03		-.15	
Hotel	-.05		.36	
Moractiv	.20		-.23	
Askprtnr	.03		.11	
Slowdanc	-.13		.48	
Thinkwom	-.11		.36	
Thinkman	.00		-.12	
Feelsex	.20		-.18	
Together	.13		-.30	
Doanal	.02		-.30	
Havanal	-.02		-.04	
Pastsex	.00		-.04	
Othrfear	.00			.02
Score I	.65			.70
Score II	.05			.06
Score III	-.07			-.05
Score IV	-.18			-.19
Score V	.24			.31
Score VI	.12			.23
Score VII	-.13			-.10

Table continues

Table 13 continued

<u>Dependent variables</u>	<u>Standardized coefficients¹</u>			
	<u>All variables</u>	<u>Subset 1</u>	<u>Subset 2</u>	<u>Subset 3</u>
<u>Groups</u>				
In	-1.33	-.69	.47	-1.10
Out	.78	.40	-.27	.64
Eigenvalue:	1.05	.28	.13	.72
χ^2 :	138.62**	51.07**	25.26	113.53**

** $p < .001$

¹For emphasis, coefficients of .5 or greater have been underlined.

Table 14

Classification Tables for Closet: Two Groups

<u>Actual group</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>	<u>Predicted group membership</u>		<u>Percent correctly classified</u>
		<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	
Group 1: In	79	67	12	83%
Group 2: Out	135	24	111	
<u>Subset 1</u>				
Group 1: In	79	38	41	71%
Group 2: Out	135	21	114	
<u>Subset 2</u>				
Group 1: In	79	48	31	66%
Group 2: Out	135	41	94	
<u>Subset 3</u>				
Group 1: In	79	68	11	82%
Group 2: Out	135	28	107	

Table 15

Discriminant Functions for Closet: Four Groups

Dependent variables	Standardized coefficients ¹		
	All variables		
	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
Age	.09	-.12	.41
Educa	-.19	.13	.09
Incom	-.20	.15	.13
Marital	-.02	.44	.08
Currentlv	-.08	-.03	.18
Occupa	.08	.00	.47
Student	.08	-.50	-.39
Firstsex	-.17	.03	.23
Feelings	.15	-.13	-.17
Wordhomo	.15	.05	-.07
Selfhomo	-.25	-.23	.34
Goga-bar	-.01	.38	.00
Rltship	-.11	-.03	-.17
Toldsmne	.07	.17	-.20
Gladgay	.26	-.06	.41
Howoften	-.19	.00	.06
Home	-.03	.05	-.17
Partners	-.14	-.07	.07
Gaybath	.04	-.18	.07
Hotel	-.08	-.11	.16
Moractiv	.06	.20	.47
Askprtnr	.14	.11	-.42
Slowdanc	-.11	-.14	-.02
Thinkwom	-.08	-.19	-.03
Thinkman	.02	.04	-.11
Feelsex	.16	.29	.07
Together	.14	.05	-.01
Doanal	.01	.11	-.04
Havanal	-.06	.43	-.09
Pastsex	.05	-.44	.05
Othrfear	-.01	.08	.03
Score I	.63	-.16	.30
Score II	-.01	.29	.14
Score III	-.11	-.19	.25
Score IV	-.26	.28	.13
Score V	.25	.20	-.07
Score VI	.10	.21	.00
Score VII	-.09	-.16	-.09

Table continues

Table 15 continued

Dependent variables	Standardized coefficients ¹		
	All variables		
	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
<u>Groups</u>			
Mostly in	-1.81	-.67	.31
Half in--half out	-1.06	.38	-.59
Mostly out	.38	.45	.32
Completely out	1.43	-.50	-.20
Eigenvalue:	1.40	.25	.14
χ^2 :	237.26**	68.82	25.40
<hr/>			
	Subset 1		
Age	-.05	.44	-.63
Educa	-.11	-.23	.02
Incom	-.08	-.46	.16
Marital	-.01	.17	-.08
Curentlv	.01	-.04	-.10
Occupa	-.13	.23	.44
Student	.01	.75	.27
Firstsex	-.27	-.19	-.38
Feelings	.08	.34	.23
Wordhomo	.16	.06	.16
Selfhomo	-.36	-.02	-.61
Gogaybar	-.12	-.54	.22
Rlttnship	-.16	-.08	.23
Toldsmne	.27	-.15	.45
Gladgay	.82	.01	-.25
<u>Groups</u>			
Mostly in	-.85	.20	-.32
Half in	-.55	-.12	.38
Mostly out	.32	-.32	-.11
Completely out	.51	.41	.06
Eigenvalue:	.29	.09	.05
χ^2 :	82.20**	29.25	10.95

** $p < .001$

Table continues

Table 15 continues

Dependent variables	Standardized coefficients ¹		
	Subset 2		
	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
Howoften	.31	.13	-.34
Home	-.13	-.13	-.05
Partners	.08	-.15	.15
Gaybath	.10	-.47	.44
Hotel	.41	.06	.07
Moractiv	-.08	<u>.53</u>	<u>.75</u>
Askprtnr	-.10	.01	-.60
Slowdanc	.42	.19	-.17
Thinkwom	.30	-.02	-.25
Thinkman	-.13	-.16	-.08
Feelsex	-.13	.42	.43
Together	-.27	-.31	-.02
Doanal	-.31	.05	.07
Havanal	-.26	.42	-.31
Pastsex	.03	-.42	-.03
<u>Groups</u>			
Mostly in	.94	-.03	.10
Half in	.02	.19	-.36
Mostly out	-.27	.20	.16
Completely out	-.23	-.41	.02
Eigenvalue:	.19	.07	.03
χ^2 :	58.34	21.65	7.81
<u>Subset 3</u>			
Othrfear	.02	.11	.07
Score I	.70	-.08	.30
Score II	.03	.39	.06
Score III	-.13	.00	<u>.81</u>
Score IV	-.27	.75	.02
Score V	.28	<u>.54</u>	.06
Score VI	.24	<u>.51</u>	-.30
Score VII	-.14	-.06	.39
<u>Groups</u>			
Mostly in	-1.54	-.20	.13
Half in	-.87	.08	-.21
Mostly out	.33	.19	.08
Completely out	1.18	-.20	-.04
Eigenvalue:	.98	.03	.01
χ^2 :	151.81**	10.19	3.32

** $p < .001$ ¹For emphasis, coefficients of .5 or greater have been underlined.

into the analysis, significant differences emerged for Function 1. Differences in scores on discriminant functions evaluated at the group means would seem to indicate that differences occur between the first group (i.e., mostly in) with the remainder of the sample. Not surprisingly, the highest coefficient values for Function 1 occur for the dependent variable, Score I (those listed as knowing about the person's sexual orientation).

In Subset 1, there were differences among groups on Function 1. Again, one variable, GLADGAY, accounted for the highest value on standardized coefficients. Differences in scores evaluated at the group means (eigenvalue = .29, $\chi^2 = 82.20$, $p < .001$) indicated that the first group differed from others; however, group mean scores were highly dissimilar for remaining groups. There were no significant differences for Subset 2. On Subset 3, the first function was able to differentiate groups with the highest coefficient values appearing on Score I. In terms of group classification, 68% were correctly classified when all variables were used, while 44% were correctly classified for Subset 1 and 53% for Subset 3. These classifications are listed in Table 16.

In summary, the discriminant analysis seems to indicate that different sets of variables distinguish the groups under investigation. While all variables differentiate all groups, some clusters or subsets of variables are better able to differentiate one group in comparison to others. For example, sexual preference groups were distinguished on the basis of sexual activities and fantasies. Those groups based on self-preferred labels could also be differentiated on sexual behaviors but the behaviors in question were different (for the most part) from the sexual preference groups. Identity management and homophobic

Table 16

Classification Tables for Closet: Four Groups

		Predicted group membership				
		All variables				
Actual group	No. of cases	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Percent correctly classified
Group 1: Mostly in	36	24	8	4	0	68%
Group 2: Half in-- half out	43	9	27	6	1	
Group 3: Mostly out	79	6	10	50	13	
Group 4: Completely out	56	0	4	8	44	
		Subset 1				
Group 1: Mostly in	36	14	9	7	6	44%
Group 2: Half in-- half out	43	7	11	11	14	
Group 3: Mostly out	79	6	11	36	26	
Group 4: Completely out	56	3	9	10	34	
		Subset 2				
Group 1: Mostly in	36	22	4	6	4	41%
Group 2: Half in-- half out	43	9	13	13	8	
Group 3: Mostly out	79	9	20	30	20	
Group 4: Completely out	56	9	5	18	24	

Table continues

Table 16 continues

Predicted group membership						
Actual group	No. of cases	Subset 3				Percent correctly classified
		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Group 1: Mostly in	36	20	12	4	0	53%
Group 2: Half in-- half out	43	14	19	7	3	
Group 3: Mostly out	79	4	16	32	27	
Group 4: Completely out	56	2	7	5	42	

prejudice scores were able to distinguish the "label" groups. Closet groups, on the other hand, differed on variables related to demographic and age-related milestone events. However, like the "label" groups, "closet" groups also were differentiated on the basis of scores on identity management and homophobic prejudice.

Differences Between Groups on All Dependent Variables

A final analysis involved comparing previous identity groups (i.e., sexual preference, label and closet) on all dependent variables.

Findings for these statistics are presented in Table 17.

The two groups that differed in terms of sexual preference reported significant differences on three dependent variables: THINKWOM (t (82) = 4.08, $p < .001$), THINKMAN (t (78) = 4.80, $p < .001$), and PASTSEX (t (213) = -4.24, $p < .001$).

Those who differed in terms of self-preferred labels reported significant differences on 10 dependent variables: GLADGAY (t (54) = -2.62, $p < .01$), SLOWDANC (t (213) = 2.38, $p < .01$), THINKMAN (t (55) = 3.09, $p < .01$), DOANAL (t (55) = -2.61, $p < .01$), SCORE I (t (213) = -3.46, $p < .001$), SCORE II (t (213) = 4.48, $p < .001$), SCORE IV (t (213) = 3.36, $p < .001$), SCORE V (213) = 213, $p < .001$), SCORE VI (t (55) = -5.05, $p < .001$), SCORE VII (t (213) = -6.12, $p < .001$).

The closet groups differed on 12 dependent variables: INCOM (t (212) = 1.58, $p < .01$), OCCUPA (t (212) = 2.83, $p < .01$), TOLDSMNE (t (193) = -5.25, $p < .01$), GLADGAY (t (90) = -5.25, $p < .001$), SLOWDANC (t (212) = 3.50, $p < .001$), SCORE I (t (203) = -11.67, $p < .001$), SCORE II (t (212) = 4.15, $p < .001$), SCORE III (t (121) = 3.37, $p < .001$), SCORE IV (t (116) = 5.14, $p < .001$), SCORE V (t (212) = -9.48, $p < .001$),

Table 17

t-tests and Anovas for Independent Variables

<u>Dependent variables</u>	<u>Preference t-value</u>	<u>Label t-value</u>	<u>Closet 2 t-value</u>	<u>Closet 4 F-value</u>
Age	-.69	.84	1.93	2.67
Education	-.54	.59	1.23	1.36
Income	.18	1.58	2.58*	2.20
Marital	2.18	.45	.70	.67
Curentlv	.93	-.58	.15	.19
Occupation	1.71	2.15	2.83*	2.77
Student	.42	.86	1.70	4.13*
Firstsex	-.54	-.15	1.35	1.40
Feelings	.23	.95	.82	.66
Wordhomo	-.43	.27	.05	.00
Selfhomo	-.14	-.37	2.21	2.90
Gogaybar	-1.49	-.75	1.67	1.81
Rltnship	1.57	.05	.85	.52
Toldsmne	.36	1.04	3.14*	3.80*
Gladgay	-1.90	-2.62*	-5.25**	13.81**
Howoften	-.86	1.04	2.18	2.02
Home	-.49	-1.79	-1.73	1.73
Partners	.99	.33	-.07	.05
Gaybath	1.32	.49	-.22	1.85
Hotel	1.60	.46	1.47	1.67

** p < .001

* p < .01

Table continues

Table 17 continued

<u>Dependent variables</u>	<u>Preference t-value</u>	<u>Label t-value</u>	<u>Closet 2 t-value</u>	<u>Closet 4 F-value</u>
Moractiv	-.01	-1.01	-.40	2.02
Askprtnr	.41	-.35	1.09	.41
Slowdanc	-.14	2.38*	3.50**	5.28**
Thinkwom	4.08**	1.97	.71	.43
Thinkman	4.80**	3.09*	-.15	.02
Feelsex	.36	.69	.31	.62
Together	.85	-.30	-1.98	2.12
Doanal	.33	-2.61*	-2.33	3.66*
Havanal	-.08	-1.32	-1.90	4.14**
Pastsex	-4.24**	-1.49	.40	.47
Othrfear	-.26	.16	-.05	.04
Score I	1.13	-3.46**	-11.67**	47.32**
Score II	1.54	4.38**	4.15**	8.21**
Score III	1.50	2.38	3.37**	8.17**
Score IV	1.09	3.36**	5.14**	16.97**
Score V	-1.57	-4.92**	-9.48**	36.75**
Score VI	-2.56	-5.05**	-4.59**	10.73**
Score VII	-1.63	-6.12**	-4.14**	6.14**

** $p < .001$

* $p < .01$

SCORE VI ($t(120) = -4.59, p < .001$), SCORE VII ($t(212) = -4.14, p < .001$).

There were significant differences among four closet groups on 13 dependent variables. These included: STUDENT ($F(3, 209) = 4.13, p < .01$), TOLDSMNE ($F(3, 191) = 3.80, p < .01$), GLADGAY ($F(3, 210) = 13.81, p < .001$), SLOWDANC ($F(3, 210) = 5.28, p < .001$), DONAL ($F(3, 210) = 3.66, p < .01$), HAVANAL ($F(3, 210) = 4.14, p < .001$), SCORE I ($F(3, 210) = 47.32, p < .001$), SCORE II ($F(3, 210) = 8.21, p < .001$), SCORE III ($F(3, 210) = 8.17, p < .001$), SCORE IV ($F(3, 210) = 16.97, p < .001$), SCORE V ($F(3, 210) = 36.75, p < .001$), SCORE VI ($F(3, 210) = 10.73, p < .001$), SCORE VII ($F(3, 210) = 6.14, p < .001$).

Section Five

Summary of Major Findings

Initially, it had been anticipated that a variety of sampling sources would yield enough respondents to represent four relatively distinct groups (see Chapter I, pp. 16-18). Instead, the sample was skewed toward respondents who tended to be totally homosexual, gay-identified, and "mostly out of the closet" (i.e., Groups 3 and 4).

In terms of identity congruency, it had been predicted that the three levels of identity (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels and being in the closet) would be highly interrelated. Respondents who had achieved identity congruency would most likely be totally homosexual, gay-identified and completely out of the closet. This predicted pattern was not evident from the results of chi-square and correlational analysis. Self-preferred label correlated only

minimally with the other two independent variables.

Intercorrelations among dependent variables indicated some significant patterns. Of particular importance to the present investigation were the interrelatedness of identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. The high correlations might be an indication that these variables share a common denominator in terms of what they measure. When the three identity measures were correlated with all the dependent variables another noteworthy pattern was evident. Sexual preference correlated with sexual fantasies and behaviors while self-preferred label and being in the closet correlated with the identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. These latter correlations suggest that perhaps the three levels of identity may be tapping different types of behavioral and attitudinal responses.

Discriminant analysis for all three dependent variables across the dependent measures confirmed what the above correlations seemed to suggest. Sexual preference groups were differentiated in terms of those dependent variables related to sexual activities and fantasies. Respondents who differed in terms of self-preferred labels were differentiated on variables related to sexual activities, fantasies, (but not the same ones that differentiated the preference groups), identity management and homophobic prejudice. Closet groups, however, were differentiated in terms of demographic and age-related milestone events and identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. In general, it would appear that the three independent variables are really measuring different phenomena--sexual behaviors distinguish groups in terms of both sexual preference and self-preferred labels, age-related milestone events differentiate groups with different labels, and

finally, identity management and homophobic prejudice differentiate groups in terms of their self-preferred labels and the extent to which they report being out of the closet.

A final analysis compared groups in terms of their mean scores on all dependent measures. Preference groups differed on items involving sexual activities and fantasies. Both "label" and "closet" groups differed significantly in terms of scores on identity management and homophobic prejudice.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present investigation examined three levels of identity (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels and being in the closet), and their relationship to identity management, sexual behaviors/fantasies, and homophobic prejudice among gay men. Three broad sets of predictions were proposed. First, with respect to the sample, four distinct groups of respondents were expected to emerge (see Chapter I, pp. 16-18). These groups were expected to differ in terms of their levels of identity congruency, identity management, sexual behaviors/fantasies, and degree of homophobic prejudice. Second, in relation to this expectation was the prediction that an optimal level of congruency would be achieved when respondents indicated simultaneously that they were totally homosexual in terms of sexual orientation, gay-identified, and completely out of the closet. Furthermore, it was assumed that one could not achieve an optimal level of identity congruency while still engaging in heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies. Third, those respondents who had achieved a sense of identity congruency would differ from others by indicating less concerns about identity management (i.e., less fears about increased openness, less passing, and less uneasiness in social situations where the revealing of sexual orientation may be pending) and evidencing lower levels of homophobic prejudice. In brief, those achieving an optimal level of identity congruency would be better adjusted in terms of integrating and managing a personal identity.

Although these three sets of expectations were not completely

confirmed, a number of interesting findings emerged. The relative strengths and limitations of the present investigation with respect to these findings will be discussed in relation to the representativeness of the sample and the relationship among research variables. Some discussion will be devoted to recommendations for future research.

Representativeness of the Sample

In researching stigmatized minorities, especially an invisible minority such as gay men, it would be presumptuous to refer to the research sample as truly representative. As McDonald and Moore (1978) and Morin (1977) have so aptly noted, given the pejorative attitudes toward gay men and their concomitant invisibility, we cannot refer to any research sample of gay men as truly representative of the entire gay population. However, sufficient research has been amassed with gay male samples that have allowed researchers to conclude that most non-clinical samples of gay men tend to be comprised of individuals who have been relatively young, white, middle-class and educated. The present sample did not deviate substantially from this description. Present respondents tended to be older (i.e., in their thirties), professional and well-educated. In brief, Gonsiorek's (1982) observations concerning non-clinical samples of gay men seem applicable here. Notably, such samples tend most often to be skewed with persons similar in status to that of the researcher--that is, white, middle-class, and educated.

Although attempts in the present study were made to broaden sampling sources to include individuals representative of four proposed groups, the sample was under-represented with respect to Groups One and Two (see Chapter I, pp. 16-19). Attempts to solicit bathhouse members

(presumably persons from Groups One and Two) were not successful. Many respondents objected to the private and personal nature of the questions posed and complained about the awkward language used--especially in reference to sexual practices. Some bathhouse members refused to participate in the study when informed that it was about "the gay lifestyle." When questioned further, some protested that they were not gay. Consequently, the final sample did not include a significant number of persons with bi-sexual or heterosexual identities who had nevertheless participated in a wide variety of homoerotic behaviors. (Ultimately, friendship network systems had to be relied upon in order to secure a sizeable sample). Also, the conventions that were sampled (i.e., AIDS forum, DIGNITY, and the association of lesbian and gay male psychologists) tended to be comprised of fairly well-educated, older, professional individuals. Convention participants obviously felt comfortable about their sexual orientation--at least sufficiently enough to be involved in the public forums mentioned above. Given the fact that the research questionnaire was returned by mail, its length, and the fact that respondents had to provide their own postage, the present sample appeared to be deeply committed to investing their time and energies in a study about their personal lives. In retrospect, the final sample tended to be skewed toward individuals who comprised Groups Three and Four--that is, persons who, for the most part, felt comfortable about their identities.

A number of factors, then, contributed to the final make-up of the research sample. These included: the lack of cooperation from bathhouse members, the sensitive nature of the questions asked and their terminology, the sampling procedure and sources chosen, and the

fact that the present respondents felt comfortable enough about their own identities to volunteer for a study about highly personal issues.

The Relationship Among Three Identities

In terms of identity congruency, one of the major predictions of the present investigation concerned the proposed interrelatedness of sexual orientation, self-preferred labels, and being "in" and "out" of the closet. Specifically, it had been predicted that an optimal level of congruency would be achieved when respondents reported simultaneously that they were "totally homosexual" in terms of sexual preference, gay-identified, and completely out of the closet. Although this pattern was apparent for some respondents ($N = 37$), the three levels of identity were not as highly interrelated as expected. In fact, correlations among them were relatively small. Furthermore, chi-squared analyses indicated considerable variability with respect to the predicted relationships among sexual preference, self-preferred labels, and being in the closet. A number of respondents had chosen gay as a preferred label while listing their sexual preference as predominantly homosexual ($N = 41$). Similarly, others, indicating that they were totally homosexual, chose non-gay labels as self-descriptive ($N = 24$). There were also respondents who were "in" to "mostly in" the closet who reported being totally homosexual ($N = 54$) while others, who stated they were "mostly out" to "completely out" of the closet, listed their sexual preference as "predominantly homosexual" ($N = 36$). Finally, nearly one-quarter of the entire sample ($N = 52$) indicated that they were gay-identified but reported being "in" to "mostly in" the closet. Similarly, a small number of respondents ($N = 17$) chose non-gay labels while reporting that they were "mostly out" to "completely out" of the

closet.

These findings raised two major issues: (1) Why didn't the predicted relationship among identity variables materialize? More specifically, why did a majority of respondents (N = 170) choose "gay" as a preferred self-descriptive label irrespective of their predicted ratings on sexual orientation and being in the closet? (2) What implications does this lack of interrelatedness have for the relationship among identity, identity management and homophobic prejudice?

The first question is probably related somewhat to the norms within the gay community that dictate how individuals will refer to one another. There seems to be a current trend within the gay community to use "gay" rather than other labels, such as "homosexual" or "homophile", as a preferred form of self-description. Over a decade ago, "homophile" was in popular usage--particularly during the initial stages of the North American gay liberation movement. Conceivably, men who are just entering the gay community and who are still "mostly in the closet", and unsure of whether they are indeed "totally homosexual" would probably still choose "gay" as self-descriptive. As pointed out in the literature review, the term "gay" has come to be regarded as one which exists in antithesis to "homosexual", with its clinical and pathological connotations (see Morin & Schultz, 1978). Although the dominant society may not be completely aware of the distinction between "gay" and "homosexual"--the term "gay" seems to appear more often on television programs, in magazines, etc., than was customary a decade ago. Such acknowledgement among some factions of the media may also be related to the preferred use of the term within the gay community.

In terms of individuals who chose non-gay labels yet indicated they were totally homosexual and out of the closet, it should be remembered that the present sample tended to be older than most. Perhaps some respondents rejected "gay" as a self-preferred label, viewing it as either too "flamboyant" and youth-oriented, or perhaps even too "political." Sexual preference may also connote varied meanings for respondents. Ultimately how closeted one chooses to be may be related more to situational factors (i.e., one's occupation) than the label one chooses as self-descriptive.

In relation to the second question, concerning the lack of interrelatedness among identity measures and their relationship to identity management and homophobic prejudice, the fact that the three levels of identity were not interrelated did not obscure the interrelatedness among identity management and homophobic prejudice scores. Intercorrelations among these scores were highly significant. Furthermore, the lack of highly integrated levels of identity seemed obvious given the discriminant function analysis which was performed. This analysis indicated that the three levels of identity may be relatively independent due to the fact that each is measuring different yet similar kinds of behavioral and attitudinal phenomena. t-tests and ANOVAs confirmed this pattern--respondents differed on a number of scores related to identity management, homophobic prejudice and sexual behaviors when compared on the basis of their sexual preference, preferred labels, and being "in" or "out" of the closet.

Sexual Preference, Label and Closet Groups

Discriminant analysis for all groups based on their respective levels of identity (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred label, and

being in the closet) revealed some interesting findings. To begin with, all dependent variables were able to differentiate all identity groups when entered simultaneously into the analysis. What that suggests is that these dependent variables share a common property in terms of their discriminating power. However, while all variables were able to differentiate all groups, some clusters or subsets of variables were better able to differentiate one group in comparison to another. These clusters or subsets included: demographic data and milestone events (Subset 1), sexual behaviors and fantasies (Subset 2), and identity management and homophobic prejudice (Subset 3). Which subsets were able to discriminate among respondents according to their respective identities represents the major significant finding of the present investigation. The importance of this result will be discussed in relation to each identity variable.

Sexual Preference

Sexual preference groups consisted of those individuals who were totally homosexual (N = 153) and the remainder of the sample (N = 62). Results of the discriminant analyses for these two groups indicated that they could be distinguished mainly on the basis of sexual behaviors and fantasies. In particular, the groups differed in terms of whether they thought about men while having relations with women and whether they also fantasized about women while having sexual relations with men. Mean scores on the t-test analyses confirmed that those respondents who listed their sexual orientation as predominantly or mostly homosexual reported such fantasies. These same respondents differed significantly from others in terms of their marital status and past sexual experiences with women. In terms of marital status, those

individuals who listed their sexual orientation as predominantly or mostly homosexual as opposed to totally homosexual; had been or were currently heterosexually-married.

These findings point to the importance of sexual fantasies as an underlying dimension of one's sexual orientation, a factor which has been mentioned in some studies (see Lehne, 1978). More importantly, such findings lend some credibility to the use of Kinsey's sexual orientation scale—one that was originally designed to measure predominantly behavioral acts, not fantasies. However, the scale is obviously limited in differentiating gay men on the basis of both age-related milestone events and identity management. Given the fact that these latter variables involve feelings and attitudes, rather than overt behaviors, one would not expect that preference groups would be differentiated on the basis of these variables.

Self-Preferred Labels

The "label" groups consisted of those who were gay-identified (N = 170) and the remainder of the sample (N = 45). On the discriminant analyses, the two groups were discriminated on the basis of sexual behaviors and fantasies (i.e., Subset 2), and identity management and homophobic prejudice (i.e., Subset 3). However, with respect to sexual behaviors, the behaviors in question differed (with the exception of thinking about men while having sexual relations with women) from those of the previous sexual preference groups. Those who were gay-identified were more willing than others to assume an insertor role in anal intercourse. It should be noted, though, that the significance level for this subset of variables (i.e., Subset 2) was relatively low (less than

.05) in comparison to the significance levels for other subsets.

In terms of the remaining subsets, the "label" groups could be discriminated on the basis of scores on identity management (Scores I-IV) and homophobic prejudice (Scores V-VII). In particular, differences appeared to be largely attributable to Score VI (NHA self subscale) and Score VII (NHA other subscale). The high coefficients on these scores suggest that attitudes toward both self-identification as homosexual and group-identification were good discriminators in terms of delineating groups based on their chosen self-descriptive labels. Those who were gay-identified reported more positive scores on both these particular homophobic prejudice subscales.

t-tests confirmed further differences between the two groups. In relation to others, those choosing "gay" as a preferred label were more glad to be gay, more often experienced in slow dancing with another man, and more likely to assume an insertor role in anal intercourse. In terms of identity management and homophobic prejudice, gay-identified respondents differed from others by: listing more significant others as knowing about the person's sexual orientation, reporting less fears about increased openness, indicating less concern about passing, and evidencing more positive scores on all three homophobic prejudice scales.

The culmination of these findings would strongly suggest that the label one chooses as self-descriptive has profound implications for a number of attitudinal and behavioral dimensions reflective of psychological adjustment. Given the findings that gay-identified individuals were less concerned about concealing their identities from significant others, engaged in fewer passing strategies, and reported lower levels of homophobic prejudice--all suggest that gay-identified

respondents may be better adjusted than others. In considering this level of adjustment, gay-identified persons appear to be closer than others to achieving a sense of identity congruency.

Weinberg's (1972) assertion that gay identities may be healthier than others bears some relevance here. Weinberg had postulated that a "gay" person is one who had rejected the negative societal stereotype associated with being homosexual. In support of this contention, Morin and Schultz (1978) had reiterated that a gay identity was healthy, and a homosexual one was not--in that a homosexual identity tended to internalize negative societal stereotypes.

Being in the Closet

The "closet" groups had been analyzed in two ways--first, with two groups and then with four. This procedure did not alter the pattern of findings from both the discriminant analyses, t-tests and ANOVAs. Similar patterns of results emerged. Closet groups could be discriminated (in the sense of being able to tell them apart) in terms of demographic data and milestone events (i.e., Subset 1) and their scores on identity management and homophobic prejudice (Subset 3).

Examination of standardized discriminant function coefficients indicate that on Subset 1 differences between groups were largely attributable to whether respondents felt glad to be gay. Mean scores for all four closet groups indicated that the more one is out of the closet, the more likely one will report feeling "glad to be gay." The reverse appears equally true--the more one is in the closet, the less likely they will report such feelings.

On Subset 3, the highest values on standardized coefficients appeared on Score I (i.e., those significant others listed as knowing

about the person's sexual orientation). Interestingly, attitudes about disclosure (Score V, NHA1 subscale) did not contribute as much to the differences between the groups as might be expected. The number of individuals that respondents list as aware of the person's sexual orientation would seem to be the best discriminator in differentiating "closet" groups. Obviously, the choice to tell others is somewhat related to whether the person feels positive (i.e., glad to be gay) about their own identity.

t-tests and analyses of variance revealed a number of significant differences among closet groups. As one moves from the first group (i.e., "in" to "mostly in the closet") to group four (i.e., "completely out") a consistent pattern across groups with respect to mean scores on identity management and homophobic prejudice emerges. (A similar pattern was also evident for the t-test analysis). The more one is out of the closet, the more likely one will: list more significant others as knowing about the person's sexual orientation, report less fears about increased openness, indicate less discomfort in social situations where the revealing of one's sexual orientation may be pending, engage in less passing strategies, and report lower levels of homophobic prejudice.

The culmination of these findings would seem to indicate that being out of the closet may be more beneficial than remaining in the closet. Scores on identity management and homophobic prejudice strongly suggest that individuals who are "mostly" to "completely out of the closet" are closer to achieving a sense of identity congruency than others. Stated another way, those who are out of the closet appear to be better adjusted on a number of social and psychological levels.

In retrospect, both self-preferred labels and being in the closet were able to differentiate groups on the basis of identity management, homophobic prejudice, sexual behaviors, fantasies, and milestone events. Taken together, self-preferred label and being in the closet appear to represent more powerful discriminators than sexual preference in terms of delineating respondents. Given the prediction that those achieving an optimal level of identity congruency would be better adjusted in terms of integrating and managing a gay identity, the findings here suggest that being gay-identified and out of the closet bring one closer to such an optimal level of congruency.

Considering the fact that both these levels of identity (i.e., self-preferred labels and being "in" or "out" of the closet) were based on terminology adopted from the minority group under investigation, there appears to be some merit in acknowledging the value systems and identities of those whom social science researchers choose to investigate. This would appear to be especially relevant in examining identity management and homophobic prejudice among gay men.

Relationships Among Dependent Variables

A final significant finding of major import to the present study concerned the interrelationship among the dependent variables--especially those related to identity management and homophobic prejudice. The high intercorrelations among these variables may be an indication that they share a common denominator in terms of what they measure. The high intercorrelations among the homophobic prejudice subscales lends further credibility to a measure that already has established indices of reliability and validity. In terms of their importance to the present study, what these intercorrelations indicate is that one's attitudes

about disclosure, being identified as homosexual and feelings about homosexuals as a reference group, are highly interrelated. A low score on one subscale is a good predictor of a low score on the others. The implications that this interrelationship has for gay men seems obvious. The importance of cultivating a positive self-image appears to have positive repercussions in terms of how gay men view their own reference group and their overall attitudes concerning disclosure.

Summary

The present investigation examined three levels of identity (i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels, and being in the closet), and their relation to identity management, sexual behaviors/fantasies, and homophobic prejudice among gay men. A primary focus of the present investigation concerned whether respondents had achieved a sense of identity congruency. It had been assumed that an optimal level of identity congruency would be achieved when respondents indicated simultaneously that they were totally homosexual in terms of sexual orientation, gay-identified and completely out of the closet. Furthermore, it was also assumed that one could not achieve an optimal level of identity congruency while still engaging in heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies. It had also been predicted that those achieving a sense of identity congruency would differ from others by indicating less concerns about identity management and evidencing lower levels of homophobic prejudice. In retrospect, those achieving an optimal level of identity congruency would be better adjusted in terms of integrating and managing a personal identity.

The predicted interrelatedness of the three levels of identity

(i.e., sexual preference, self-preferred labels, and being in the closet) was not borne out. Results from the discriminant function analyses suggested that these three identities could be considered independent, given the different behaviors and attitudes that appear to discriminate groups. When considered separately, each level of identity provides some confirmation for the predicted definitions of identity congruency. For example, among sexual preference groups, those who were "totally homosexual" as opposed to "predominantly homosexual" appeared closer to achieving a sense of identity congruency. They differed significantly from others by not engaging in heterosexual erotic behaviors and fantasies. Similarly, both gay-identified respondents and those who were out of the closet were closer to achieving an optimal level of identity congruency. They differed significantly from others by indicating less concerns about identity management (i.e., less fears about increased openness, less passing and less uneasiness in social situations where the revealing of sexual orientation may be pending), and reporting lower levels of homophobic prejudice. The culmination of these findings suggest that those respondents who are better adjusted in terms of integrating and managing a personal identity tend to be totally homosexual with respect to sexual preference, gay-identified and out of the closet.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present investigation was an initial attempt to explore the relationship between various identities and identity management among gay men. The instruments that were used to measure these variables were relatively new. Many of them of necessity did not have established

indices of reliability and validity. The findings of the present study were also gleaned from a "biased" sample--one that tended to be older, professional, and highly educated. Nevertheless, the identities chosen for investigation were able to delineate respondents in terms of their sexual behaviors/fantasies, identity management, and levels of homophobic prejudice. Obviously, replicating the study would provide further credibility to the findings presented here.

Future research concerned with identities and identity management could profit from attempts to secure a more diversified sample of gay men--especially those who define themselves as heterosexual or bisexual, and those who are closeted. As difficult as it may be to obtain respondents who are not gay-identified and closeted, attempts should be made to include these subjects in investigations of homosexuality. Despite some ethical issues, Humphreys (1970) was able to do so in his studies of married men who engaged in washroom sex. Given the fact that the present sample was predominantly white, middle-class and largely professional, obviously some attempts would have to be made to sample gay men from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds, those in blue-collar occupations, and from socially and economically impoverished segments of the gay community. Otherwise, our research findings will continue to be based on samples that are comprised of white, middle-class, gay-identified respondents who feel relatively comfortable about their identities--at least comfortable enough to complete social science questionnaires.

If attempts are made to reach a more diversified section of the gay community, then some attention must also be given to the language used in the research questionnaire. Although Nungesser's homophobic

prejudice scale proved useful as a discriminating measure, the language is sophisticated, and at times, cumbersome. However, this did not prove to be a problem with the present respondents who tended to be highly educated.

Finally, more research is needed that would explore the relationship between various identities and individual differences in the coming out process (see McDonald, 1982). For example, are the time lapses that occur between various milestone events in the coming out process related to the identities that gay men choose or their styles of identity management? Some attention needs also to be given to establishing measures of identity management with proven indices of reliability and validity. A factor analysis of the various items that comprise the respective identity management scores (i.e., fears associated with greater openness, passing strategies, and ease/discomfort in social situations where revealing one's sexual orientation may be pending) would probably improve its psychometric strength. Irrespective of these psychometric refinements, hopefully, future research on gay identities will continue to be carried out with the expressed purpose of improving the lives of gay men while furthering the psychological knowledge of homosexuality.

APPENDIX A
LETTER OF EXPLANATION



Dear Sir:

I would appreciate the cooperation and support of the club/bath management and executive in helping me obtain some information.

I am currently completing the doctoral degree dissertation requirement in Psychology at the University of Windsor. I am in the process of collecting data concerned with feelings and attitudes about the gay life style. I would therefore appreciate your cooperation in distributing the enclosed questionnaire to your members.

The questionnaire, found inside the self-addressed booklet, takes about 3/4 hour to complete. Respondents will not be required to sign their names to any portion of the survey nor will they be asked to supply their place of residence.

You might consider distributing the questionnaire to club/bath members as they leave the premises. May I suggest, however, that you inform prospective respondents about the purpose, nature, etc., of the survey through an advertisement in your club/bath newsletter with possible excerpts from this letter. In addition, information outlining the purposes of research appear on the front cover of the testing booklet.

With your help, I expect that the results of this survey will produce more positive information about homosexuality than has been traditionally reported in journals of psychological research.

If you are in agreement with the above proposal, please accept these questionnaires. I will forward more upon request. If you have any questions, please correspond accordingly. Thank you!

Cordially,

GD/ld
Encl.

Gary J. McDonald
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
N9B 3P4

APPENDIX B
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

About the Questionnaire

I am currently completing the doctoral degree in Psychology at the University of Windsor. My dissertation topic concerns feelings and attitudes about the gay life style.

I would appreciate your assistance in completing this questionnaire. Investing some time and energy to complete these questions may be one of the ways you can contribute to a better understanding of what it means to be gay. Your contribution is important.

In order to protect your anonymity and ensure complete confidentiality, do not write your name or place of residence on the questionnaire. Return the completed questions as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 1983. (Due to my limited budget, I am asking participants to supply the cost of a postage stamp).

The results of this survey, when completed, will be made available upon request. Thank you and good luck!

GM/ld

Gary J. McDonald, M.A.
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
CANADA, N9B 3P4

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION

QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION

Region	Number Distributed
AIDS Forum, Winnipeg - August 15, 1983	300
Association of Lesbian and Gay Psychologists Suite-- American Psychological Association convention, Anaheim, August 26-30, 1983	200
DIGNITY convention, Seattle, September 1-4, 1983	250
Social clubs, baths, gay liberation groups, Metropolitan Community Church, London, Ontario	250
Baths and Friendship networks, Windsor	200
Total Distributed	1200

APPENDIX D
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATIONRespondent Number _____
(Do Not Mark)

1. SEX _____ Male _____ Female

2. AGE _____ years

3. HOW FAR HAVE YOU GONE IN YOUR EDUCATION?

_____ some grade school

_____ completed grade school

_____ some high school

_____ completed high school

_____ some university or community college

_____ completed undergraduate degree (BA, BED)

_____ graduate or professional degree (MA, PHD, MD)

4. WHAT IS YOUR AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME BEFORE DEDUCTIONS?

_____ less than \$5,000

_____ \$5,000 to \$9,999

_____ \$10,000 to \$14,999

_____ \$15,000 to \$19,999

_____ \$20,000 to \$24,999

_____ \$25,000 to \$29,000

_____ \$30,000 to \$34,999

_____ over \$35,000

5. WHAT IS YOUR RACE OR ETHNIC ORIGIN?

_____ White

_____ Black

_____ Oriental/Asian

_____ Hispanic

_____ Native (Metis or Indian)

_____ Other

6. WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION?

<input type="checkbox"/> Protestant	<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/> Catholic	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Eastern Orthodox	<input type="checkbox"/> None

7. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS?

<input type="checkbox"/> Single	<input type="checkbox"/> Separated
<input type="checkbox"/> Married heterosexually	<input type="checkbox"/> Widowed
<input type="checkbox"/> Divorced	

8. I AM CURRENTLY LIVING:

☐ by myself

☐ with parents

☐ with a gay roommate(s) who is not my lover

☐ with roommate who is my lover

☐ with straight roommate(s)

☐ with wife

☐ other

9. IF YOU HAVE CHILDREN, ARE THEY LIVING WITH YOU?

☐ Yes ☐ No

10. I THINK OF MYSELF AS:

☐ totally heterosexual

☐ predominantly heterosexual

☐ more heterosexual than homosexual

☐ equally heterosexual and homosexual

☐ more homosexual than heterosexual

☐ predominantly homosexual

☐ totally homosexual

11. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TERMS DO YOU PREFER IN DESCRIBING YOURSELF
(PICK ONE ONLY)

<input type="checkbox"/> Straight	<input type="checkbox"/> Gay
<input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual	<input type="checkbox"/> None of these
<input type="checkbox"/> Homosexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Something else (Print it here _____)

12. WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION? _____

13. ARE YOU PRESENTLY EMPLOYED? ☐ Yes ☐ No

14. ARE YOU CURRENTLY A STUDENT? ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART II: EARLY EXPERIENCES

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ASK YOU TO REMEMBER SOME OF YOUR EARLIEST FEELINGS AND EXPERIENCES. IF YOU HAVE NOT HAD THE EXPERIENCE DESCRIBED BELOW--THEN LEAVE THAT QUESTION BLANK.

15. WHAT AGE WERE YOU WHEN YOU HAD YOUR FIRST SAME-SEX EXPERIENCE? _____
16. AT WHAT AGE DID YOU BECOME AWARE OF FIRST HOMOSEXUAL FEELINGS? _____
17. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU UNDERSTOOD WHAT THE WORD "HOMOSEXUAL" MEANT? _____
18. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU CONSIDERED YOURSELF "HOMOSEXUAL"? _____
19. AT WHAT AGE DID YOU START ASSOCIATING WITH OTHER GAY MEN (GOING TO BARS, PARTIES, ETC.)? _____
20. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU HAD YOUR FIRST LONG-TERM LOVE RELATIONSHIP WITH ANOTHER MAN? _____
21. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU TOLD SOMEONE ELSE (OTHER THAN A GAY PERSON) THAT YOU WERE "HOMOSEXUAL"? _____
22. AT WHAT AGE DID YOU DECIDE THAT YOU WERE GLAD TO BE GAY? _____

PART III: TELLING OTHERS

PLACE AN X BESIDE THOSE PERSONS WHO DEFINITELY KNOW ABOUT YOUR HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVITIES OR IDENTITY. IF THE PERSON IS NO LONGER ALIVE OR THE RELATIONSHIP DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PUT AN N/A IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

23. _____ Your mother _____ Closest heterosexual male friend
 _____ Your father _____ Closest heterosexual female friend
 _____ Brother(s) _____ Your employer
 _____ Sister(s) _____ Your wife
 _____ Relatives _____ Your children
 _____ A person at work or school _____ The media or public at large

IN RELATION TO MOST PEOPLE I KNOW, I WOULD DESCRIBE MYSELF AS:

24. _____ Definitely in the closet
 _____ In the closet most of the time
 _____ Half in and half out
 _____ Mostly out of the closet
 _____ Completely out of the closet

PART IV: FEARS ABOUT OPENNESS

FROM THE FOLLOWING LIST INDICATE HOW IMPORTANT THESE THINGS HAVE BEEN IN KEEPING YOU FROM BEING MORE OPEN.

- (1) Not at all important (4) Important
 (2) A little important (5) Very important
 (3) Somewhat important

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|---|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 25. I would be afraid of job/income loss | : _____ : | _____ : | _____ : | _____ : | _____ : |
| 26. I would be afraid of endangering my job effectiveness and credibility | : _____ : | _____ : | _____ : | _____ : | _____ : |

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|---|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 27. I would be looked down upon and probably lose friends | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 28. I would be endangering my lover's career | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 29. I would endanger my lover's family relations | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 30. I would endanger relations with my immediate family (parents, brothers) | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 31. I would endanger relations with my wife and/or children | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 32. I would become entangled in unnecessary legal problems | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 33. STATE ANY OTHER FEARS NOT APPEARING ON THIS LIST THAT CONCERN YOU. | | | | | |

PART V: FEELINGS ABOUT DISCLOSURE

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT, PUT AN 'X' IN THE PLACE THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION. CHOICES RANGE FROM STRONGLY DISAGREE TO STRONGLY AGREE.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| (1) Strongly Disagree | (4) Agree |
| (2) Disagree | (5) Strongly Agree |
| (3) Neutral | |

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|--|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 34. I wouldn't mind if my boss knew that I am gay | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 35. When I tell my friends about my homosexuality, I do not worry that they will try to remember things about me that would make me appear to fit the stereotype of a homosexual | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|---|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 36. When I am sexually attracted to another man, I do not mind if someone else knows how I feel | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 37. When women know of my homosexuality, I am afraid they will not relate to me as a man | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 38. I would not mind if my neighbours knew that I am gay | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 39. It is important for me to conceal the fact that I am gay from most people | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 40. If my straight friends knew of my homosexuality, I would be uncomfortable | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 41. If it were made public that I am homosexual, I would be extremely unhappy | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 42. If my peers knew of my homosexuality, I am afraid that many would not want to be friends with me | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 43. If others knew of my homosexuality, I would not be afraid that they would see me as being effeminate | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 44. When I think about coming out to a peer I am afraid they will pay more attention to my body movements and voice inflections | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 45. I am afraid that people will harass me if I come out more publicly | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 46. When I think about coming out to a heterosexual male friend, I do not worry that he might watch me to see if I do things that are stereotypically homosexual | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 47. If men knew of my homosexuality, I am afraid they would begin to avoid me | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |

PART VI: SOCIAL SITUATIONS

THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS MAY OR MAY NOT BE A PART OF YOUR DAY-TO-DAY ACTIVITIES. READ EACH STATEMENT THEN INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT EACH SITUATION. IF YOU CANNOT IMAGINE YOURSELF IN THESE SITUATIONS, LEAVE THE QUESTION BLANK. CHOICES RANGE FROM NOT AT ALL UNCOMFORTABLE TO EXTREMELY UNCOMFORTABLE.

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (1) Not uncomfortable | (4) Quite uncomfortable |
| (2) Slightly uncomfortable | (5) Extremely uncomfortable |
| (3) Somewhat uncomfortable | |

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 48. Going out in public with a group of gay men | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 49. Getting a motel room for yourself and your lover | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 50. Getting a motel room with a double bed for yourself and your lover | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 51. Going to a straight (e.g., heterosexual) party alone | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 52. Going to a straight party with your lover | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 53. Going alone to a movie which depicts gay men | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |
| 54. Going to such a movie with another gay man | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: | : _____: |

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
55. Buying a book about homosexuality	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
56. Going to a nice restaurant with your lover	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
57. Going repeatedly to the same restaurant with your lover	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
58. Having your lover pick you up at work or school	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
59. Having your lover phone you frequently at work	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
60. Going to a concert, play or opera with your lover	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
61. Having straight friends to your home with your lover present	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
62. Having relatives to your home with your lover present	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
63. Attending a family gathering alone	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
64. Attending a family gathering with your lover	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
65. Attending a close heterosexual friend's wedding alone	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
66. Attending a close heterosexual friend's wedding with your lover	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
67. Hearing straights tell a homosexual joke	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
68. Telling a homosexual joke to straights	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :
69. Filling out an application form that requests marital status information	: ____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

70. Having a job interview : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :
 where one's marital status
 is discussed

PART VII: SOCIAL APPEARANCES

THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS INVOLVE THINGS THAT WE MIGHT DO TO KEEP OTHERS FROM KNOWING ABOUT OUR HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVITIES AND IDENTITY. IF YOU HAVE ENGAGED IN ANY OF THESE ACTIVITIES IN THE PAST SIX MONTHS, PLACE AN 'X' BESIDE THE STATEMENT. OTHERWISE, LEAVE THE STATEMENT BLANK.

71. ____ Using the pronoun "she" instead of "he" to refer to a gay male roommate, friend or lover
72. ____ Pretending to be engaged
73. ____ Actually getting engaged in order to keep up appearances
74. ____ Pretending to be married (i.e., wearing a wedding ring, etc.)
75. ____ Actually getting married in order to keep up appearances
76. ____ Pretending to date women
77. ____ Actually dating women in order to keep up appearances
78. ____ Inviting a woman as your "date" to social functions
79. ____ Lying about your living situation
80. ____ Avoiding any personal talk about your living situation
81. ____ Avoid being seen in public places with gay friends
82. ____ Pretending not to see or recognize a gay person when with straight people
83. ____ Pretending not to see or recognize a straight friend when with gay people
84. ____ Introducing your lover or partner to others as a "friend"
85. ____ Failing to introduce your lover to a straight friend or group of friends when it would have been appropriate to do so
86. ____ Hiding gay books or records when straight friends or relatives come to visit
87. ____ Asking your lover to leave your home or pretend to be a visitor when straight friends drop over

PART VIII: SEXUAL ACTIVITIES

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE MORE PERSONAL AND ASK YOU TO SHARE YOUR SEXUAL FEELINGS AND BEHAVIORS. AGAIN, PLACE AN 'X' BESIDE THE STATEMENT THAT DESCRIBES YOU

88. ON THE AVERAGE, HOW OFTEN DO YOU HAVE SEX WITH ANOTHER MAN?

- ☐ more than once a day
- ☐ once a day
- ☐ several times a week
- ☐ once a week
- ☐ several times a month
- ☐ once a month
- ☐ once or twice a year
- ☐ never

89. CHECK THOSE PLACES WHERE YOU FREQUENTLY HAVE SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH OTHER MEN

- ☐ your home
- ☐ your partner's home
- ☐ a friend's home
- ☐ gay bath
- ☐ beach
- ☐ park
- ☐ public restroom
- ☐ car
- ☐ van or camper
- ☐ motel or hotel
- ☐ bar
- ☐ secluded woods or field
- ☐ peep show or pornographic movie house

90. ON THE AVERAGE, DURING SEX, DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU ARE MORE PHYSICALLY ACTIVE THAN YOUR PARTNER?

☐ much more active
☐ a little more active
☐ the same
☐ a little less active
☐ much less active

91. HOW OFTEN DO YOU ASK YOUR PARTNER FOR WHAT YOU WANT DONE TO YOU?

☐ always
☐ frequently
☐ not often
☐ never

92. HAS "NECKING" (i.e., KISSING) BEEN A PART OF YOUR SEXUAL PRACTICES WITH OTHER MEN?

☐ yes, often
☐ yes, a few times
☐ yes, once
☐ no, never

93. HAVE YOU EVER DANCED "SLOW" DANCES WITH ANOTHER MALE?

☐ yes, often
☐ yes, a few times
☐ yes, once
☐ no, never

94. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN IN LOVE WITH ANOTHER MAN?

☐ yes
☐ no
☐ not sure

95. DO YOU EVER THINK ABOUT WOMEN WHEN HAVING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH MEN?

- ☐ no, never,
- ☐ yes, once
- ☐ yes, a few times
- ☐ yes, often

96. DO YOU EVER THINK ABOUT MEN WHEN HAVING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH WOMEN?

- ☐ no, never
- ☐ yes, once
- ☐ yes, a few times
- ☐ yes, often
- ☐ not applicable--don't have sex with women

97. IF YOU ARE LEGALLY MARRIED TO A WOMAN, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR MARRIAGE?

- ☐ completely satisfied
- ☐ somewhat satisfied
- ☐ neutral
- ☐ somewhat dissatisfied
- ☐ completely dissatisfied

98. ON THE AVERAGE, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUALITY OF SEXUAL EXPERIENCES YOU HAVE WITH MEN?

- ☐ completely satisfied
- ☐ somewhat satisfied
- ☐ neutral
- ☐ somewhat dissatisfied
- ☐ completely dissatisfied

99. FROM THE FOLLOWING LIST OF SEXUAL ACTIVITIES, CHECK OFF THOSE ACTIVITIES WHICH YOU HAVE ENGAGED IN WHILE HAVING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANOTHER MAN

☐ doing oral sex on your partner
☐ having oral sex done to you
☐ simultaneous oral sex (69)
☐ masturbating (jerking off) your partner
☐ your partner masturbates you
☐ masturbating together
☐ doing anal sex on your partner
☐ having anal sex done to you

100. IN THE PAST, HAVE YOU EVER HAD SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH WOMEN?

☐ yes, often
☐ yes, a few times
☐ yes, once
☐ no, never

101. ARE YOU CURRENTLY HAVING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH WOMEN?

☐ yes, often
☐ yes, a few times
☐ yes, once
☐ no, never

PART IX: ATTITUDES

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS, PUT AN 'X' IN THE PLACE THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION. CHOICES RANGE FROM STRONGLY DISAGREE TO STRONGLY AGREE

(1) Strongly Disagree

(4) Agree

(2) Disagree

(5) Strongly Agree

(3) Neutral

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
102. When I am in a conversation with a homosexual and he touches me, it does not make me uncomfortable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
103. Homosexuality is not as good as heterosexuality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
104. Whenever I think a lot about being a homosexual, I feel depressed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
105. Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human males	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
106. Male homosexuals do not dislike women any more than heterosexual males dislike women	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
107. Marriage between two homosexuals should be legalized	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
108. I am glad to be gay	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
109. When I am sexually attracted to a close male friend, I feel uncomfortable	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
110. Male homosexuals are overly promiscuous	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
111. Most problems that homosexuals have come from their status as an oppressed minority, not from their homosexuality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

- | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|--|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 112. I am proud to be a part of the gay community | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 113. My homosexuality does not make me unhappy | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 114. Homosexual lifestyles are not as fulfilling as heterosexual lifestyles | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 115. Choosing an adult gay lifestyle should be an option for children | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 116. Whenever I think a lot about being homosexual, I feel critical about myself | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 117. Homosexuality is a sexual perversion | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 118. I wish I were heterosexual | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 119. I do not think that I will be able to have a long term relationship with another man | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 120. I am confident that my homosexuality does not make me inferior | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |
| 121. Adult homosexual males who have sex with boys under 18 years of age should be punished by law | : ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : | ____ : |

THAT'S ALL. YOU ARE FINISHED. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

NOW, THE ONLY THING LEFT TO DO IS MAIL THE QUESTIONNAIRE. IF AN ENVELOPE HAS NOT BEEN PROVIDED, FOLD YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DOTTED LINE AND TAPE IT.

AGAIN, THANKS FOR YOUR HELP!

APPENDIX E
NHAI SUBSCALES AND SCORING KEYS

NHAI "SELF" SUBSCALE A AND SCORING KEY

1. When I am in a conversation with a homosexual and he touches me, it does not make me uncomfortable. (+)
2. Whenever I think a lot about being a homosexual, I feel depressed. (-)
3. I am glad to be gay. (+)
4. When I am sexually attracted to a close male friend, I feel uncomfortable. (-)
5. I am proud to be part of the gay community. (+)
6. My homosexuality does not make me unhappy. (+)
7. Whenever I think a lot about being homosexual, I feel critical about myself. (-)
8. I wish I were heterosexual. (-)
9. I do not think that I will be able to have a long-term relationship with another man. (-)
10. I am confident that my homosexuality does not make me inferior. (+)

NHAI "OTHER" SUBSCALE B AND SCORING KEY

1. Homosexuality is not as good as heterosexuality. (-).
2. Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human males. (+)
3. Male homosexuals do not dislike women any more than heterosexual males dislike women. (+)
4. Marriage between two homosexuals should be legalized. (+)
5. Male homosexuals are overly promiscuous. (-)
6. Most problems that homosexuals have come from their status as an oppressed minority, not from their homosexuality. (+)
7. Homosexual lifestyles are not as fulfilling as heterosexual lifestyles. (-)
8. Choosing an adult gay lifestyle should be an option for children. (+)
9. Homosexuality is a sexual perversion. (-)
10. Adult homosexual males who have sex with boys under 18 years of age should be punished by law. (-)

NHAI "DISCLOSURE" SUBSCALE C AND SCORING KEY

1. I wouldn't mind if my boss knew that I am gay. (+)
2. When I tell my friends about my homosexuality, I do not worry that they will try to remember things about me that would make me appear to fit the stereotype of a homosexual. (+)
3. When I am sexually attracted to another man, I do not mind if someone else knows how I feel. (+)
4. When women know of my homosexuality, I am afraid they will not relate to me as a man. (-)
5. I would not mind if my neighbors knew that I am gay. (+)
6. It is important for me to conceal the fact that I am gay from most people. (-)
7. If my straight friends knew of my homosexuality, I would be uncomfortable. (-)
8. If it were made public that I am homosexual, I would be extremely unhappy. (-)
9. If my peers knew of my homosexuality, I am afraid that many would not want to be friends with me. (-)
10. If others knew of my homosexuality, I would not be afraid that they would see me as being effeminate. (+)
11. When I think about coming out to a peer, I am afraid they will pay more attention to my body movements and voice inflections. (-)
12. I am afraid that people will harass me if I come out more publicly. (-)
13. When I think about coming out to a heterosexual male friend, I do not worry that he might watch me to see if I do things that are stereotypically homosexual. (+)
14. If men knew of my homosexuality, I am afraid they would begin to avoid me. (-)

APPENDIX F
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

AGE

Age group	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category	Cumulative percentage
21 years or younger	10	4.7	4.7
22-29	53	24.8	29.3
30-39	95	44.2	73.5
40-49	40	18.8	92.1
50 years or older	17	7.1	100.0

EDUCATION

Educational level completed	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category	Cumulative percentage
Some high school	10	4.7	4.7
High school matriculation	19	8.8	13.5
Some university	51	23.7	37.2
Undergraduate degree	61	28.4	65.2
Graduate degree	74	34.4	100.0

INCOME

Annual salary range	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category	Cumulative percentage
Less than \$5,000	13	6.0	6.0
\$5,000-\$9,999	18	8.4	14.4
\$10,000-\$14,999	24	11.2	25.6
\$15,000-\$19,999	25	11.6	37.2
\$20,000-\$24,999	34	15.8	53.0
\$25,000-\$29,000	39	18.1	71.2
\$30,000-\$34,999	24	11.2	82.3
Over \$35,000	38	17.7	100.0

OCCUPATION

Occupational description*	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category
Unskilled laborer	9	4.2
Semi-skilled	4	1.9
Skilled	19	8.8
White-collar clerical	7	3.3
Small business owner	21	9.8
Semi-professional	41	19.1
Business manager	27	12.6
Professional	60	27.9
No occupation listed	27	12.6

* These descriptions are based on the occupational classification system developed by Pineo and Porter (1967).

RELIGION

Religious affiliation	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category
Protestant	80	37.2
Catholic	81	37.7
Eastern Orthodox	2	.9
Jewish	5	2.3
Other	13	6.0
None	33	15.3

CURRENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT

Living arrangement	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category
By myself	101	47.0
With parents	16	7.4
Gay roommate--not lover	27	12.6
With lover	55	25.6
With straight roommate	6	2.8
Wife	3	1.4
Other	6	2.8

APPENDIX G

RESPONDENTS' SCORES ON SEXUAL PREFERENCE,
SELF-PREFERRED LABELS AND BEING IN THE CLOSET

SEXUAL PREFERENCE

Category	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category	Cumulative percentage
Equally both	1	.5	.5
More homosexual than heterosexual	15	7.0	7.4
Predominantly homosexual	46	21.4	28.8
Totally homosexual	153	71.2	100.0

SELF-DESCRIPTIVE LABEL

Category	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category	Cumulative percentage
Straight	2	.9	.9
Bisexual	6	2.8	3.7
Homosexual	26	12.1	15.8
Gay	170	79.1	94.9
None	7	3.3	98.1
Other	4	1.9	100.0

4

IN AND OUT OF THE CLOSET

Category	Number of subjects in each category	Percentage in each category
Definitely in the closet	15	7.0
In the closet most of the time	21	9.8
Half in and half out	44	20.5
Mostly out	79	36.7
Completely out of the closet	56	26.0

APPENDIX H
CORRELATIONS AMONG ALL DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Correlations Among All Dependent Variables

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Educa</u>	<u>Incom</u>	<u>Marital</u>	<u>Curentlv</u>	<u>Occupa</u>	<u>Student</u>
Age							
Education	.24**						
Income	.44**	.34**					
Marital	.25**	-.13	.10				
Curentlv	-.05	-.05	.03	.19*			
Occupation	.37**	.39**	.59**	.07	.01		
Student	.35**	-.05	.41**	.14	-.08	.27**	

**p < .001

*p < .01

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Firstsex</u>	<u>Feelings</u>	<u>Worshomo</u>	<u>Selfhomo</u>	<u>Gogaybar</u>	<u>Rltnship</u>	<u>Toldsmme</u>	<u>Gladgay</u>
Age	.13	.29**	.38**	.43**	.59**	-.17*	.62**	-.07
Education	.14	-.02	.04	.07	.15	.00	.21*	.05
Income	.15	.11	.11	.28**	.25**	.03	.32**	-.05
Marital	-.02	.20*	.19*	.33**	.31**	-.12	.35**	-.07
Currentlv	.02	.07	.04	.11	.02	.02	-.05	.00
Occupation	.13	.17*	.10	.24**	.26**	-.10	.26**	.08
Student	.12	.17*	.17	.12	.22**	-.10	.25**	-.11

** p < .001

* p < .01

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Othrfear</u>	<u>How often</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Partners</u>	<u>Gay bath</u>	<u>Hotel</u>	<u>Moractiv</u>	<u>Askprtnr</u>
Age	-.05	.05	.10	.20*	.15	.03	-.07	.04
Education	-.02	.08	.00	-.06	-.04	-.10	.09	-.20*
Income	-.07	-.02	.09	-.18*	-.02	-.11	-.02	-.08
Marital	.02	-.08	.02	.00	.10	.10	-.07	.03
Currentlv	.12	-.27**	-.09	-.16	-.08	.00	-.13	-.01
Occupation	-.06	.16*	-.01	-.05	.01	-.01	.01	-.06
Student	.02	.09	.12	-.09	.08	.02	-.08	-.12

** $p < .001$
 * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Slowdanc</u>	<u>Thinkwom</u>	<u>Thinkman</u>	<u>Feelsex</u>	<u>Together</u>	<u>Doanal</u>	<u>Havanal</u>	<u>Pastsex</u>
Age	.29**	-.12	.00	-.10	-.17*	-.28**	-.20*	-.06
Education	.15	-.01	.03	.09	.03	-.09	.01	-.01
Income	.09	.00	.10	-.09	.01	-.09	-.04	-.13
Marital	.07	-.01	.24**	-.10	.06	-.01	.02	-.51**
Curentlv	.04	.05	.05	-.02	-.06	.04	-.05	-.21*
Occupation	.18**	-.01	.07	-.04	.00	-.10	-.07	-.03
Student	.03	.01	.04	-.08	.05	-.07	-.03	-.03

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Score I</u>	<u>Score II</u>	<u>Score III</u>	<u>Score IV</u>	<u>Score V</u>	<u>Score VI</u>	<u>Score VIII</u>
Age	-.21*	.04	-.06	-.08	-.20*	.00	.05
Education	.03	-.02	.00	-.10	.08	.06	.10
Income	-.07	.02	-.10	.03	-.07	.00	-.08
Marital	.02	.19*	.05	.11	-.12	.00	-.03
Currently	.02	.00	-.05	.08	.03	.08	.07
Occupation	-.10	.03	-.05	-.01	-.19	-.08	-.17
Student	-.07	-.02	-.10	.03	-.16*	-.07	-.16*

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Firstsex</u>	<u>Feelings</u>	<u>Wordhomo</u>	<u>Selfhomo</u>	<u>Gogaybar</u>	<u>Rltnship</u>	<u>Toldsmne</u>	<u>Gladgay</u>
Firstsex								
Feelings	.49**							
Wordhomo	.41**	.68**						
Selfhomo	.30**	.56**	.52**					
Gogaybar	.34**	.39**	.47**	.63**				
Rltnship	-.20*	-.13	-.19*	-.17*	-.29**			
Toldsmne	.39**	.52**	.52**	.67**	.74**	-.20*		
Gladgay	.00	-.04	-.05	-.02	.00	-.02	-.10	

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Othrfear</u>	<u>Howoften</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Partners</u>	<u>Gay bath</u>	<u>Hotel</u>	<u>Moractiv</u>	<u>Askprtnr</u>
Firstsex	.00	.05	-.01	.10	-.05	-.01	.00	.04
Feelings	-.02	.03	.09	-.01	.04	.07	-.09	.01
Wordhomo	-.07	.08	.10	-.03	-.01	-.02	-.07	.02
Selfhomo	-.06	-.04	.11	-.09	.11	.05	-.04	.04
Gogaybar	.00	.07	.10	-.08	-.04	.03	-.01	.09
Rltnship	-.08	-.20*	.05	-.11	-.06	.00	.00	-.08
Toldsame	.02	.03	.03	-.10	.05	.01	.02	.08
Gladgay	-.05	-.16*	.19*	-.01	.00	-.02	.00	-.10

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

Variable	Slowdano	Thinkwom	Thinkman	Feelsex	Together	Doanal	Havanal	Pastsex
Firstsex	.05	-.04	-.13	.05	-.10	.03	.00	.18*
Feelings	.00	-.01	-.03	-.13	-.11	.00	-.12	-.03
Wordhomo	.06	-.10	-.07	-.07	-.12	-.07	-.14	.03
Selfhomo	.15	-.04	.00	-.06	-.06	-.01	-.03	-.18*
Gogaybar	.36**	-.13	-.06	-.03	-.09	-.19*	-.13	-.08
Rltship	-.13	.14	.07	-.04	.11	.05	.05	-.14
Toldsmne	.29**	-.09	.00	-.13	.08	-.17*	-.16	-.11
Gladgay	-.06	-.01	-.05	-.14	.11	.15	.19*	-.07

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

Variable	Score I	Score II	Score III	Score IV	Score V	Score VI	Score VII
Firstsex	-.13	-.10	.04	-.04	-.06	-.01	.06
Feelings	-.16*	-.01	.02	-.04	-.14	-.01	-.06
Wordhamo	-.14	-.07	.07	-.06	-.18*	.00	.04
Selfhamo	-.17*	.06	.06	.00	-.08	.02	.00
Gogaybar	-.16*	.03	.07	-.03	-.12	.07	.03
Rlttnship	.05	.10	.09	.08	.04	.01	.00
Toldsmre	-.34**	.17*	.13	-.01	-.21*	-.05	-.12
Gladgay	.30**	-.10	.19*	-.16*	.38**	.43**	.25**

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Othrfeare</u>	<u>Howoften</u>	<u>Home</u>	<u>Partners</u>	<u>Gaybath</u>	<u>Hotel</u>	<u>Moractiv</u>	<u>Askprtnr</u>
Othrfeare								
Howoften	-.02							
Home	-.04	-.22**						
Partners	-.06	.11	-.04					
Gaybath	-.01	-.09	-.12	-.11				
Hotel	.00	-.05	-.13	.13	.28**			
Moractiv	.03	.11	-.07	.02	-.05	-.10		
Askprtnr	-.07	.03	-.14	.06	.00	.05	.06	

** p < .001
 * p < .01

Appendix H continued

Variable	Slowdanc	Thinkwom	Thinkman	Feelsex	Together	Doanal	Havanal	Pastsex
Othrfear	-.02	.09	.09	.02	.11	-.04	-.05	.02
Howoften	.16*	-.15	-.08	.35**	-.05	-.12	-.16*	.21*
Home	-.13	.01	-.04	-.14	.11	.12	.09	-.14
Partners	-.04	-.16*	-.01	.14	.07	-.01	.08	.06
Gaybath	.00	.11	.18*	-.05	-.02	.08	.00	-.06
Hotel	.02	.00	.07	-.04	.10	.03	.10	-.07
Moractiv	.08	.17*	-.03	-.09	.01	.07	-.05	.11
Askprtnr	.15	-.13	-.10	.02	-.19*	-.14	-.14	.13

** $p < .001$

* $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Score I</u>	<u>Score II</u>	<u>Score III</u>	<u>Score IV</u>	<u>Score V</u>	<u>Score VI</u>	<u>Score VII</u>
Othrfear	.01	-.08	.00	.06	.00	-.03	.08
Howoften	-.16*	.05	.18	-.04	-.20*	-.20*	-.13
Home	.14	-.09	-.03	-.04	.17*	.11	.02
Partners	.05	-.06	.06	-.09	-.03	-.11	-.07
Gaybath	.00	.05	.01	-.05	-.06	-.12	-.02
Hotel	-.10	-.02	.01	.06	-.16*	-.08	-.06
Moractiv	-.06	.06	.02	.01	-.02	-.07	-.02
Askpntnr	-.20*	.10	.06	.02	-.18*	-.13	-.14

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Slowdanc</u>	<u>Thinkwom</u>	<u>Thinkman</u>	<u>Feelsex</u>	<u>Together</u>	<u>Doanal</u>	<u>Havanal</u>	<u>Pastsex</u>
Slowdanc								
Thinkwom	.01							
Thinkman	-.01	.21**						
Feelsex	.03	.10	.00					
Together	-.17*	.08	.06	-.01				
Doanal	-.22**	.07	.03	-.08	.18*			
Havanal	-.22**	.01	.09	-.01	.18*	.47**		
Pastsex	.08	-.18*	-.38**	.15	-.12	-.05	-.17*	

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

Variable	Score I	Score II	Score III	Score IV	Score V	Score VI	Score VII
Slowdanc	-.27**	.18*	.09	.01	-.24**	.23**	-.22**
Thinkwom	.03	.14	.10	.22**	-.06	-.14	-.06
Thinkman	.19*	.18*	.08	.06	-.07	-.13	-.08
Feelsex	-.03	.00	.26**	.05	-.06	-.27**	.14
Together	.20*	.03	.00	-.06	.13	.09	.10
Doanal	.24**	-.14	-.13	-.04	.16*	.14	.14
Havanal	.23**	-.11	-.11	-.04	.14	.14	.12
Pastsex	-.20*	-.14	-.03	-.09	-.02	-.01	.05

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Appendix H continued

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Score I</u>	<u>Score II</u>	<u>Score III</u>	<u>Score IV</u>	<u>Score V</u>	<u>Score VI</u>	<u>Score VII</u>
Score I							
Score II	-.33**						
Score III	-.20*	.30**					
Score IV	-.35**	.34**	.34**				
Score V	.63**	-.36**	.36**	.47**			
Score VI	.24**	-.29**	-.36**	.30**	.51**		
Score VII	.31**	-.24**	-.19*	-.28**	.45**	.57**	

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

APPENDIX I
ABBREVIATED CODES OF RESEARCH VARIABLES

ABBREVIATED CODES OF RESEARCH VARIABLES

<u>Research Question</u>	<u>Abbreviated Code</u>
3. How far have you gone in your education?	EDUCA
4. What is your average annual income before deductions?	INCOM
5. What is your race or ethnic origin?	RACE
6. What is your religion?	RELIGION
7. What is your marital status?	MARITAL
8. I am currently living:	CURENILV
9. If you have children, are they living with you?	CHILDLV
10. I think of myself as:	PREFERENCE
11. Which of the following terms do you prefer in describing yourself?	LABEL
12. What is your occupation?	OCCUPA
13. Are you presently employed?	JOBNOW
14. Are you currently a student?	STUDENT
15. What age were you when you had your first same-sex experience?	FIRSTSEX
16. At what age did you become aware of first homosexual feelings?	FEELINGS
17. How old were you when you understood what the word "homosexual" meant?	WORDHOMO
18. How old were you when you considered yourself "homosexual"?	SELFHOMO
19. At what age did you start associating with other gay men (going to parties, bars, etc.)?	GOGAYBAR
20. How old were you when you had your first long-term love relationship with another man?	RLTNSHIP

continued

Appendix I continued

<u>Research Question</u>	<u>Abbreviated Code</u>
21. How old were you when you told someone else (other than a gay person) that you were "homosexual"?	TOLDSMNE
22. At what age did you decide that you were glad to be gay?	GLADGAY
24. In relation to most people I know, I would describe myself as	CLOSET
88. On the average how often do you have sex with another man?	HOWOFTEN
89. Check those places where you frequently have sexual relations with other men (_____ your home).	HOME
90. On the average, during sex, do you feel that you are more physically active than your partner?	MORACTIV
91. How often do you ask your partner for what you want done to you?	ASKPRINR
92. Has "necking" (i.e., kissing) been a part of your sexual practices with other men?	KISSING
93. Have you ever danced slow dances with another man?	SLOWDANC
94. Have you ever been in love with another man?	INLOVE
95. Do you ever think about women when having sexual relations with men?	THINKWOM
96. Do you ever think about men when having sexual relations with women?	THINKMAN
98. On the average, how do you feel about the quality of sexual experiences you have with men?	FEELSEX

continued

Appendix I continued

<u>Research Question</u>	<u>Abbreviated Code</u>
99. From the following list of sexual activities, check off those activities which you have engaged in while having sexual relations with another man:	
_____ masturbating together	TOGETHER
_____ doing anal sex on your partner	DOANAL
_____ having anal sex done to you	HAVANAL
100. In the past, have you ever had sexual relations with women?	PASTSEX
101. Are you currently having sexual relations with women?	CURNTSEX
23. Place an X beside those persons who definitely know about your homosexual activities or identity (disclosure to significant others)	SCORE I
Questions 25-32 - Fears about Openness	SCORE II
Questions 48-70 - Social Situations-Ease/Comfort	SCORE III
Questions 71-87 - Social Appearances - Passing	SCORE IV
Questions 34-47 - NAHI disclosure subscale	SCORE V
Questions 102, 104, 108, 109, 112, 113, 116, 118, 119 and 120 - NAHI self subscale	SCORE VI
Questions 103, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 114, 115, 117 and 121 - NAHI other subscale	SCORE VII

REFERENCES

- Carlson, R. (1971). Where is the person in personality research?
Psychological Bulletin, 75, 203-219.
- Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model.
Journal of Homosexuality, 4, 219-235.
- Cass, V. (in press). Homosexual identity: A concept in need of a
definition. Journal of Homosexuality.
- Coleman, E. (1981/92). Developmental stages of the coming out process.
Journal of Homosexuality, 7(2/3), 31-43.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). Human nature and the social order. New York:
Scribners.
- Dank, B. M. (1971). Coming out in the gay world. Psychiatry, 34, 180-
197.
- de Monteflores, C., & Schultz, S. J. (1978). Coming out: Similarities
and differences for lesbians and gay men. Journal of Social Issues,
34(3), 59-72.
- Elliott, P. (1981). Predicting and disclosing a lesbian identity.
Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Windsor.
- Erikson, E. (1968). Identity, youth and crisis. New York: Norton.
- Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gonsiorek, J. C. (1982). Introduction: Part II mental health. In
W. Paul, J. D. Weinrich, J. C. Gonsiorek, & M. E. Hatvedt (Eds.),
Homosexuality: Social, psychological and biological issues (pp. 57-70).
Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Hencken, J. D., & O'Dowd, W. T. (1977). Coming out as an aspect of identity formation. Gai Saber, 1(1), 18-22.
- Humphreys, L. (1970). Tearoom trade: Impersonal sex in public places. Chicago: Aldine.
- Humphreys, L. (1979). Exodus and identity: The emerging gay culture. In M. P. Levine (Ed.), Gay men: The sociology of male homosexuality (pp. 134-147). New York: Harper & Row.
- Humphreys, L., & Miller, B. (1980). Identities in the emerging gay culture. In J. Marmor (Ed.), Homosexual behavior: A modern reappraisal (pp. 142-156). New York: Basic Books.
- Jay, C., & Young, A. (1979). The gay report. New York: Summit Books.
- Kooden, H. D., Morin, S. F., Riddle, D. I., Rogers, M., Sang, B. E., & Strassburger, F. (1979). Removing the stigma: Final report of the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology's Task Force on the Status of Lesbian and Gay Male Psychologists. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Lee, A. (1966). Multivalent man. New York: George Braziller.
- Lee, J. A. (1977). Going public: A study in the sociology of homosexual liberation. Journal of Homosexuality, 3, 49-78.
- Lehne, G. K. (1978). Gay male fantasies and realities. Journal of Social Issues, 34(3), 28-37.
- Lindquist, N. (1976). Adaptation to marginal status: The case of gay males. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Malyon, A. K. (1981). The homosexual adolescent: Developmental issues and social bias. Child Welfare, 60, 321-330.

- McDonald, G. J. (1982). Individual differences in the coming out process for gay men: Implications for theoretical models. Journal of Homosexuality, 8(1), 47-60.
- McDonald, G. J. (1983, August). Sampling gay populations: Subject selection bias and assessment of sexual orientation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, CA.
- McDonald, G. J. (1983, August). The significance of gay community participation to psychological adjustment. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, CA.
- McDonald, G. J., & Moore, B. J. (1978). Sex-role self-concepts of homosexual men and their attitudes toward both women and male homosexuality. Journal of Homosexuality, 4(1), 3-14.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, B. (1978). Adult sexual resocialization: Adjustments towards a stigmatized identity. Alternative Lifestyles, 1(2), 207-234.
- Minton, H. L., & McDonald, G. J. (in press). Homosexual identity formation as a developmental process. Journal of Homosexuality.
- Morin, S. F., & Garfinkle, E. M. (1978). Male homophobia. Journal of Social Issues, 34(1), 29-47.
- Morin, S. F., & Schultz, S. J. (1978). The gay movement and the rights of children. Journal of Social Issues, 34(2), 137-148.
- Morin, S. F. (1977). Heterosexual bias in psychological research and lesbianism and male homosexuality. American Psychologist, 32, 629-637.
- Moses, A. E. (1978). Identity management in lesbian women. New York: Praeger.

- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. (1975). SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nungesser, L. (1979). Homophobic prejudice in homosexual males. Unpublished honors thesis, Stanford University, Stanford.
- Plummer, K. (1975). Sexual stigma: An interactionist account. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ponté, M. (1974). Life in a parking lot: An ethnography of a homosexual drive-in. In J. Jacobs (Ed.), Deviance: Field studies and self-disclosures (6-29). Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.
- Rainwater, L. (1970). Behind ghetto walls: Black families in a federal slum. Chicago: Aldine.
- Richardson, D. (1981). Lesbian identities. In J. Hart & D. Richardson (Eds.), The theory and practice of homosexuality (111-124). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Riddle, D. I., & Morin, S. F. (1977, November). Removing the stigma: Data from individuals. APA Monitor, 16; 28.
- Saram, F., & Hirabayashi, G. (1980). The political dimension of ethnicity and types of ethnic identification. In K. V. Ujimoto & G. Hirabayashi (Eds.), Asian Canadians in multi-cultural Canada (109-136). Guelph, Ontario: University of Guelph Press.
- Schafer, S. (1976). Sexual and social problems of lesbians. Journal of Sex Research, 12, 50-69.
- Sommers, M. (1982). The relationship between present social support networks and current levels of interpersonal congruency of gay identity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.

- Spada, J. (1979). The Spada report. New York: Signet.
- Stone, G. (1962). Appearance and the self. In A. Rose (Ed.), Human behavior and social processes. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 86-118.
- Strauss, A. (1959). Mirrors and masks: The search for identity. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Tripp, C. W. (1975). The homosexual matrix. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Troiden, R. (1974). Homosexual encounters in a highway rest stop. In E. Goode & R. Troiden (Eds.), Sexual deviance and sexual deviants, 211-227. New York: William Morrow.
- Troiden, R. R. (1979). Becoming homosexual: A model for gay identity acquisition. Psychiatry, 42, 362-373.
- Weinberg, G. (1972). Society and the healthy Homosexual. New York: St. Martin's.
- Weinberg, M. S., & Williams, C. J. (1974). Male homosexuals: Their problems and adaptations. New York: Oxford University Press.

VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: Gary J. McDonald

PLACE OF BIRTH: Toronto, Ontario

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1949

POST SECONDARY EDUCATION AND DEGREES:

University of Saskatchewan
Regina, Saskatchewan
1969-1973 B.A. Honours (with High Honours)

University of Regina
Regina, Saskatchewan
1973-1977 M.A.

University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
1980-1984 Ph.D.

AWARDS, NOMINATIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS:

Social Science and Humanities Research Award (formerly Canada Council),
Doctoral Fellowship, 1980-1983.

1981 Mark Freedman Memorial Award for outstanding research on the
psychological investigation of homosexuality. Presented by the AGP
executive at eighty-ninth annual convention of the American
Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August, 1981.

Elected Chairperson of the Canadian Psychological Associations Section
on Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology at the annual meeting of the
Canadian Psychological Association, Toronto, June, 1981.

Elected Chairperson of the Canadian Psychological Associations Section
on Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology at the annual meeting of the
Canadian Psychological Association, Calgary, June, 1980.

Elected Chairperson of the Canadian Psychological Associations Special
Interest Group on Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology at the annual
meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Quebec City, June, 1979.

1978 Mark Freedman Memorial Award for outstanding research on the
psychological investigation of homosexuality. Presented by the AGP
executive at the eighty-sixth annual convention of the American
Psychological Association, Toronto, August, 1978.

Saskatchewan Psychological Associations' Certificate in Clinical
Psychology, awarded May, 1977.

PUBLICATIONS

Homosexual Identity Formation as a Developmental Process. Journal of Homosexuality, Vol. 9, No. 2 (in press). (With H. L. Minton as senior author).

Individual Differences in the Coming Out Process for Gay Men: Implications for Theoretical Models. Journal of Homosexuality, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Fall, 1982).

Misrepresentation, Liberalism and Heterosexual Bias in Introductory Psychology Textbooks. Journal of Homosexuality, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Spring, 1981).

Sex-role Self-concepts of Homosexual Men and their Attitudes toward both Women and Male Homosexuality. Journal of Homosexuality, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Fall, 1978).

PAPERS DELIVERED

Sampling Gay Populations: Selection Bias and Assessment of Sexual Orientation. Paper presented at the ninety-first annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, August, 1983.

The Significance of Gay Community Participation to Psychological Adjustment. Paper presented at the ninety-first annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, August, 1983.

Sexism and Heterosexual Bias in Psychological Literature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Ontario Psychological Association, Toronto, February, 1983.

In and Out of the Closet: Similarities and Differences for Gay Men. Paper presented at the ninetieth annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, August, 1982.

Self-disclosure, social sex-role self-concepts and attitudes toward women among gay men. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Montreal, June, 1982.

Misrepresentation and Heterosexual Bias in Introductory Psychology Textbooks. Paper delivered in Open Forum at the eighty-ninth annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August, 1981.

Individual Differences in the Coming Out Process for Gay Men. Paper presented at the eighty-ninth annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August, 1981.

The relationship between identity formation, community participation and self-disclosure in the coming out process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Toronto, June, 1981.

Identity Formation in the Coming Out Process: An Empirical Investigation of Linear Progressive Models. Paper presented at the eighth annual meeting of the Canadian Sex-Research Forum, Niagra-on-the-Lake, October, 1980.

Coming Out: An Empirical Investigation of Theoretical Models. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Calgary, June, 1980.

Misrepresentation, Liberalism and Heterosexual Bias in Introductory Psychology Textbooks. Paper presented at the seventh annual meeting of the Canadian Sex-Research Forum, Banff, October, 1979.

The Images of Lesbian Women and Homosexual Men in Psychology Textbooks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Quebec City, June, 1979.

Sex-role Self-concepts, Attitudes toward Women and Male Homosexuality in Homosexual Men. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Ottawa, June, 1978.

Sex-role Self Concept, Attitudes toward Woman and Male Homosexuality in a Non-clinical Sample of Homosexual Men. Paper presented at the fifth annual meeting of the Canadian Sex-Research Forum, Banff, September, 1977.

The Relationship between Sex-role Self-concepts, Attitudes toward Women and Male Homosexuality in a Non-clinical Sample of Homosexual Men. Paper presented in an AGP suite session at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August, 1977.

The Relationship between Sex-role Stereotypes, Attitudes toward Women and Male Homosexuality in a Non-clinical Sample of Homosexual Men. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Toronto, June, 1976.

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Psychological Association
(Member #1589-0303 A) Divisions: 8, 9, 20 and 35.

Canadian Psychological Association
(Member #018648)

Canadian Sex-Research Forum

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI)